THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Edited by
G. Johannes Botterweck
Helmer Ringgren
Heinz-Josef Fabry

VOLUME X

THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY

OF THE

OLD TESTAMENT

EDITED BY

G. JOHANNES BOTTERWECK,

HELMER RINGGREN,

AND

HEINZ-JOSEF FABRY

Translated by

DOUGLAS W. STOTT

Volume X

נָקַם ־ עָזַב

nāqam — *ʿāzaḇ*

William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company
Grand Rapids, Michigan / Cambridge, U.K.

CONSULTING EDITORS

George W. Anderson
Henri Cazelles
David Noel Freedman
Shemaryahu Talmon
Gerhard Wallis

CONTRIBUTORS

†C. Barth, Basel
K.-M. Beyse, Halle am Saale
J. Conrad, Leipzig
C. Dohmen, Bonn
H.-J. Fabry, Bonn (Editor)
G. Fleischer, Bonn
D. N. Freedman, Ann Arbor/San Diego
H. F. Fuhs, Würzburg
F. Garcia-López, Salamanca
E. Gerstenberger, Giessen
E. Haag, Lucerne
J. Hausmann, Neuendettelsau
B. Holmberg, Lund
F. L. Hossfeld, Bonn
A. S. Kapelrud, Oslo
B. Kedar-Kopfstein, Haifa
†D. Kellermann, Tübingen
K. Koch, Hamburg
T. Kronholm, Madla
H. Lamberty-Zielinski, Bonn
†D. Levy, Berkeley
E. Lipiński, Louvain
H. Madl, Graz
P. Maiberger, Mainz
C. Meyers, Duke
J. Milgrom, Berkeley
†M. J. Mulder, Badhoevedorp
H. Niehr, Würzburg
M. Ottosson, Uppsala
B. Otzen, Århus
H. D. Preuss, Neuendettelsau
F. Reiterer, Salzburg
E. Reuter, Bonn
H. Ringgren, Uppsala (Editor)
L. Ruppert, Freiburg im Breisgau
U. Rüterswörden, Kiel
M. Sæbø, Sandviken
J. Scharbert, Munich
J. Schreiner, Würzburg
K.-D. Schunck, Rostock
H. Seebass, Bonn
H. Simian-Yofre, Rome
L. A. Snijders, Huizen
W. von Soden, Münster
F. J. Stendebach, Mainz
A. Stiglmair, Bressanone
L. Wächter, Berlin
S. Wagner, Leipzig
G. Wallis, Halle am Saale
G. Warmuth, Kiel
B. E. Willoughby, Ann Arbor
D. P. Wright, Provo
H.-J. Zobel, Greifswald

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

AANLR	*Atti dell'Academia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti,* Rome
AASOR	*Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research,* New Haven, Ann Arbor, Philadelphia
AAWLM.G	*Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz,* Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, Wiesbaden
AB	*The Anchor Bible,* ed. W. F. Albright and D. N. Freedman, Garden City, N.Y.
ABL	R. F. Harper, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters,* 14 vols. (Chicago, 1892-1914)
ABLAK	M. Noth, *Aufsätze und biblischen Lander- und Altertumskunde,* 2 vols. (Neukirchen, 1971)
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review,* Melbourne
abs.	absolute
acc.	accusative
AcOr	*Acta orientalia,* Copenhagen, Leiden
act.	active
AcThD	*Acta theologica danica,* Århus, Copenhagen
adj.	adjective
adv.	adverb, adverbial
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung,* Graz
AGSU	*Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums,* Leiden
AHw	W. von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch,* 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1965-81)
AION	*Annali dell'Istituto Universitario Orientali di Napoli*
AJBA	*Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology,* Sydney
AJP	*American Journal of Philology,* Baltimore
AJSL	*The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures,* Chicago
AJT	*American Journal of Theology,* Chicago
AKGW	*Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft des Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*
Akk.	Akkadian
AKM	*Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes,* Leipzig, Wiesbaden, Hildesheim
ALUOS	*Annals of Leeds University Oriental Society*
Amhar.	Amharic
Amor.	Amorite
AnAcScFen	*Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae,* Helsinki
AnBibl	*Analecta biblica,* Rome
AncIsr	R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (Eng. trans., New York, 1961, repr. 1965)
ANEP	*The Ancient Near East in Pictures,* ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, ²1955, ³1969)
ANET	*Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the OT,* ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, ²1955, ³1969)
ANH	G. Dalman, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch,* Göttingen, ³1938
AnOr	*Analecta orientalia,* Rome
AnSt	*Anatolian Studies,* Leiden
ANVAO	*Avhandlinger utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo*
AO	*Tablets in the Collection of the Musée de Louvre,* Paris
AOAT	*Alter Orient und AT,* Kevelaer, Neukirchen-Vluyn

AOB	*Altorientalische Bilder zum AT,* ed. H. Gressmann (Berlin, ^{2}1927)
AO Beihefte	*Beiheft zum Alte Orient,* Leipzig
AOS	*American Oriental Series,* New Haven
AOT	*Altorientalische Texte zum AT,* ed. H. Gressmann (Berlin, ^{2}1926, repr. 1953)
AP	A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (1923, repr. Osnabruck, 1976)
APN	K. Tallqvist, *Assyrian Personal Names. ASSF* 43/1 (1914, repr. 1966)
APNM	H. B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts* (Baltimore, 1965)
Arab.	Arabic
ARAB	D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia,* 2 vols. (Chicago, 1926-27)
Aram.	Aramaic
ARM	*Archives royales de Mari. Textes cunéiformes,* Paris
ArOr	*Archiv orientální,* Prague
ARW	*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft,* Freiburg, Leipzig, Berlin
AS	*Assyriological Studies,* Chicago
ASAE	*Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte,* Cairo
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
ASORDS	*ASOR Dissertation Series,* Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
ASSF	*Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae,* Helsinki
Assyr.	Assyrian
ASTI	*Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem,* Leiden
AT	Altes Testament, Ancien Testament, etc.
ATA	*Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen,* Münster
ATANT	*Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments,* Zurich
ATD	*Das AT Deutsch,* ed. V. Herntrich and A. Weiser, Göttingen
ATR	*Anglican Theological Review,* Evanston
ATS	*Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im AT,* St. Ottilien, Munich
AuS	G. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina,* 7 vols. (1928-42, repr. Hildesheim, 1964)
AUSS	*Andrews University Seminary Studies,* Berrien Springs
AzT	*Arbeiten zur Theologie,* Stuttgart
BA	*The Biblical Archaeologist,* New Haven, Ann Arbor, Philadelphia, Atlanta
Bab.	Babylonian, Babylonian Talmud
BAfO	*Beiheft zur AfO*
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review,* Washington
BA Reader	*Biblical Archaeologist Reader,* ed. D. N. Freedman et al., 3 vols. (1961-70, repr. Winona Lake, 1975), vol. 4 (Sheffield, 1983)
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research,* New Haven, Ann Arbor, Philadelphia, Baltimore
BBB	*Bonner biblische Beiträge*
BBET	*Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie,* Frankfurt, Las Vegas
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT* (Oxford, 1907; Peabody, Mass., ^{2}1979)
BDBAT	*Beiheft zur Dielheimer Blätter zum AT*
Beeston	A. F. L. Beeston, *Sabaic Dictionary* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1982)
Benz	F. L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions. StPohl* 8 (1972)
BeO	*Bibbia e oriente,* Milan
BethM	*Beth Miqra,* Jerusalem
BETL	*Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium,* Paris, Gembloux
BEvT	*Beiträge zur evangelische Theologie,* Munich
Beyer	K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen, 1984)

BFCT	*Beiträge zur Förderung christliches Theologie,* Gütersloh
BHHW	*Biblisch-historisches Handwörterbuch,* ed. L. Rost and B. Reicke, 4 vols. (Göttingen, 1962-66; index and maps, 1979)
BHK	*Biblia hebraica,* ed. R. Kittel (Stuttgart, ^{3}1929)
BHS	*Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia,* ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph (Stuttgart, 1966-77)
BHT	*Beiträge zur historischen Theologie,* Tübingen
BibB	*Biblische Beiträge,* Fribourg
Bibl	*Biblica,* Rome
bibliog.	bibliography
Biella	J. Biella, *Dictionary of Old South Arabic, Sabaean Dialect. HSS* 25 (1982)
BIES	*Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society,* Jerusalem (= *Yediot*)
BietOr	*Biblica et orientalia,* Rome
BIFAO	*Bulletin de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale,* Cairo
BiKi	*Bibel und Kirche,* Stuttgart
BiLe	*Bibel und Leben,* Düsseldorf
BiLi	*Bibel und Liturgie,* Klosterneuberg
BiOr	*Bibliotheca orientalis,* Leiden
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library,* Manchester
BK	*Biblischer Kommentar AT,* ed. M. Noth and H. W. Wolff, Neukirchen-Vluyn
BL	*Bibel-Lexikon,* ed. H. Haag (Einsiedeln, 1951, ^{2}1968)
BLe	H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des ATs* (1918-22, repr. Hildesheim, 1991)
BMAP	E. G. Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* (New Haven, 1953)
BN	*Biblische Notizen,* Bamberg
Bo	*Bogazköy: Istanbul and Berlin Inventory*
BOT	*De Boeken van het OT,* Roermond en Maaseik
BR	*Biblical Research,* Chicago
BRA	*Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums,* Halle
BRL	K. Galling, *Biblisches Reallexikon. HAT* (1937, ^{2}1977)
BS	*Bibliotheca sacra,* Dallas
BSAW	*Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* London
BSt	*Biblische Studien,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
BT	*The Bible Translator,* London
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin,* Rome
Buber-Rosenzweig	M. Buber and F. Rosenzweig, *Die Schrift,* 4 vols. (Heidelberg, 1954-62)
BVC	*Bible et vie chrétienne,* Paris
BWA(N)T	*Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament,* Leipzig, Stuttgart
BWL	W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford, 1960)
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift,* Paderborn
BZAW	*Beihefte zur ZAW,* Berlin
ca.	circa, about
CAD	*The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (1956–)
CAH^{3}	*Cambridge Ancient History,* ed. I. E. S. Edwards et al. (Cambridge, 1970–)
CahRB	*Cahiers de la RB,* Paris
Can.	Canaanite
CAT	*Commentaire de l'AT,* Neuchâtel
CB	*Coniectanea biblica, OT Series,* Lund
CBC	*Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible,* Cambridge

CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* Washington
CBQMS	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series*
CBS	*University Museum of the University of Pennsylvania,* Philadelphia
CD A, B	Damascus document, manuscript A, B
cf.	compare, see
ch(s).	chapter(s)
CH	Code of Hammurabi
CHAL	W. L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the OT* (Leiden/ Grand Rapids, 1971)
ChW	J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums,* 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1867-68, repr. 1959)
CIH	*Corpus inscriptionum himyariticarum* (= *CIS,* IV)
CIJ	*Corpus inscriptionum judicarum* (Vatican, 1936–)
CIL	*Corpus inscriptionum latinarum* (Berlin, 1862–)
CIS	*Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum* (Paris, 1881–)
CML	G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh, 1956; ^{2}1977, ed. J. C. L. Gibson)
col.	column
comm(s).	commentary(ies)
conj.	conjecture
const.	construct
ContiRossini	K. Conti Rossini, *Chrestomathia arabica meridionalis ephigraphica* (Rome, 1931)
Copt.	Coptic
CRAI	*Comptes rendus des séances de l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres,* Paris
CSD	R. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford, 1903, repr. 1976)
CT	*Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum,* London
CTA	A. Herdner, *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit,* 2 vols. (Paris, 1963)
CThM	*Calwer theologische Monographien,* Stuttgart
D	D (doubling) stem
DAWB	*Deutsch Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin. Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft*
DB	*Dictionnaire de la Bible,* ed. F. Vigouroux (Paris, 1895-1912)
DBS	*Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement,* ed. L. Pirot et al. (Paris, 1926–)
dir.	direct
diss.	dissertation
DJD	*Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (Oxford, 1955–)
DLZ	*Deutsche Literaturzeitung,* Berlin
DMOA	*Documenta et monumenta orientis antiqui,* Leiden
DN	deity name
DNSI	J. Hoftijzer and K. Jongeling, *Dictionary of North-West Semitic Inscriptions,* 2 vols. (Leiden, 1995)
DtrN	nomistic Deuteronomistic source
DtrP	prophetic Deuteronomistic redactor
DTT	*Dansk teologisk Tidsskrift,* Copenhagen
E	Elohistic source
EA	Tell el-Amarna tablets
EAEHL	*Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land,* ed. M. Avi-Yonah and E. Stern, 4 vols. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1975-78)
Eb.	Eblaite
EB	*Die Heilige Schrift in deutscher Übersetzung. Echter-Bibel,* Würzburg

ÉBib	*Études bibliques,* Paris
ed.	edition, editor
EdF	*Erträge der Forschung,* Darmstadt
EDNT	*Exegetical Dictionary of the NT,* ed. H. Balz and G. Schneider, 3 vols. (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1990-93)
Egyp.	Egyptian
EH	*Europäische Hochschulschriften,* Frankfurt, Bern
EHAT	*Exegetisches Handbuch zum AT,* Münster
EMiqr	*Enṣiqlōpedyā miqrāʾit (Encyclopedia Biblica)* (Jerusalem, 1950–)
emph.	emphatic(us)
EncBib	*Encyclopaedia Biblica,* ed. T. K. Cheyne, 4 vols. (London, 1900-1903, repr. 1958)
EncJud	*Encyclopaedia judaica,* 16 vols. (Jerusalem, New York, 1971-72)
EnEl	Enuma Elish
Eng.	English
ERE	*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* ed. J. Hastings, 13 vols. (New York, 1913-27)
Erg.	Ergänzungsheft, Ergänzungsreihe
ErIsr	*Eretz-Israel,* Jerusalem
esp.	especially
EstBíb	*Estudios bíblicos,* Madrid
Eth.	Ethiopic
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses,* Louvain
EÜ	Einheitsübersetzung der Heilige Schrift (Stuttgart, 1974-80)
EvT	*Evangelische Theologie,* Munich
ExpT	*Expository Times,* Edinburgh
fasc.	fascicle
fem.	feminine
fig(s).	figure(s)
fr(s).	fragment(s)
FRLANT	*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments,* Göttingen
FS	Festschrift
FThS	*Frankfurter theologische Studien,* Frankfurt am Main
FuF	*Forschungen und Fortschritte,* Berlin
FzB	*Forschung zur Bibel,* Würzburg
GaG	W. von Soden, *Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik. AnOr* 33 (1952, ^{2}1969 [with Erg., *AnOr* 47])
Ger.	German
GesB	W. Gesenius and F. Buhl, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT* (Berlin, ^{17}1921, ^{18}1987–)
GesTh	W. Gesenius, *Thesaurus philologicus criticus linguae hebraecae et chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti,* 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1829-58)
Gilg.	Gilgamesh epic
Gk.	Greek
GK	W. Gesenius and E. Kautsch, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Halle, ^{28}1909) (= Kautsch and A. E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* [Oxford, ^{2}1910])
GM	*Göttingen Miszellen. Beiträge zur ägyptologischen Diskussion*
GSAT	*Gesammelte Studien zum AT,* Munich
GTA	*Göttinger theologische Arbeiten*
GTT	*Gereformeerd theologisch Tijdschrift,* Aalten, Kampen
GTTOT	J. J. Simons, *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the OT. SFS* 2 (1959)

Guillaume	A. Guillaume, *Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography* (repr. Leiden, 1965)
GUOST	*Glasgow University Oriental Society Transactions,* Glasgow
H	Holiness Code
Habil.	Habilitationschrift
HAL	L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner et al., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the OT,* 5 vols. plus Sup (Eng. trans., Leiden, 1967-96)
HAR	*Hebrew Annual Review,* Columbus, Ohio
HAT	*Handbuch zum AT,* ser. 1, ed. O. Eissfeldt, Tübingen
HD	*Heiliger Dienst,* Salzburg
HDB	*Dictionary of the Bible,* ed. J. Hastings, 4 vols. (Edinburgh, 1898-1902; *Sup,* 1904; New York, ^{2}1963)
Heb.	Hebrew
Herm	*Hermeneia,* Philadelphia, Minneapolis
HerTS	*Hervormde Teologiese Studies,* Pretoria
HeyJ	*Heythrop Journal,* Oxford
Hitt.	Hittite
HKAT	*Handkommentar zum AT,* ed. W. Nowack, Göttingen
HO	*Handbuch der Orientalistik,* Leiden
HP	E. Jenni, *Das hebräische Piʿel* (Zurich, 1968)
HS	*Die Heilige Schrift des ATs,* ed. F. Feldmann and H. Herkenne, 8 vols. (Bonn, 1930-31)
HSAT	*Die Heilige Schrift des ATs,* ed. E. Kautsch and A. Bertholet, 4 vols. (Tübingen, ^{4}1922-23)
HSM	*Harvard Semitic Monographs,* Cambridge, Mass.
HSS	*Harvard Semitic Series/Studies,* Cambridge, Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review,* Cambridge, Mass.
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual,* Cincinnati
Hurr.	Hurrian
IB	*The Interpreter's Bible,* ed. G. A. Buttrick, 12 vols. (Nashville, 1952-57)
ICC	*The International Critical Commentary,* Edinburgh
IDB	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible,* ed. G. A. Buttrick, 4 vols. (Nashville, 1962); *Sup,* ed. K. Crim (Nashville, 1976)
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal,* Jerusalem
ILC	J. Pedersen, *Israel: Its Life and Culture,* 4 vols. in 2 (Eng. trans., Oxford, 1926-40, ^{5}1963)
ILR	*Israel Law Review,* Jerusalem
impf.	imperfect
impv.	imperative
inf.	infinitive
in loc.	on this passage
Int	*Interpretation,* Richmond
Intro(s).	Introduction(s) (to the)
IPN	M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung. BWANT* 46[III/10] (1928, repr. 1980)
J	Yahwist source (J^{1}, earliest Yahwist source)
JA	*Journal asiatique,* Paris
JAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum,* Münster
JANES	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University,* New York
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society,* Baltimore, Boston, New Haven
JARCE	*Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt,* Boston
Jastrow	M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (1903; repr. 2 vols. in 1, Brooklyn, 1975)
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature,* Philadelphia, Missoula, Chico, Atlanta

JBLMS	*JBL Monograph Series*, Philadelphia, Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
JBR	*Journal of Bible and Religion*, Boston
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, New Haven, Cambridge, Mass., Philadelphia, Baltimore
JE	Yahwist-Elohist source
JEA	*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, London
JEN	*Joint Expedition of the Iraq Museum at Nuzi*, Paris
Jer.	Jerusalem (Palestinian) Talmud
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*, London
JM	P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. Subsidia biblica* 14/I-II (Eng. trans. 1991)
JMEOS	*Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society*, Manchester
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Chicago
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*, Stellenbosch
JPOS	*Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, Jerusalem
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*, Philadelphia
JSHRZ	*Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, Gütersloh
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*, Leiden
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the OT*, Sheffield
JSOTSup	*Journal for the Study of the OT, Supplement*, Sheffield
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*, Manchester
JTC	*Journal for Theology and the Church*, New York
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*, Oxford
Jud	*Judaica*, Zurich
K	*Kethibh*
KAI	H. Donner and W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften*, 3 vols. (Wiesbaden, ^{2}1966-69, ^{3}1971-76)
KAR	*Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts*, Leipzig
KAT	*Kommentar zum AT*, ed. E. Sellin and J. Herrmann, Leipzig, Gütersloh
KBL	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden, ^{1}1953, ^{2}1958, ^{3}1967–96)
KBo	*Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköy. WVDOG* (1916–)
KD	C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch, *Comm. on the OT*, 10 vols. (Eng. trans., repr. Grand Rapids, 1954)
KEHAT	*Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum AT*, ed. O. F. Fridelin (Leipzig, 1812-96)
KHC	*Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum AT*, ed. K. Marti, Freiburg/Leipzig/Tübingen
KlPauly	*Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike*, ed. K. Ziegler and W. Sontheimer, 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1962-75)
KlSchr	*Kleine Schriften* (A. Alt [Munich, 1953-59, ^{3}1964]; O. Eissfeldt [Tübingen, 1962-79]; K. Elliger [*ThB* 32 (1966)]; E. Meyer [Halle, 1910-24])
KTU	*Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit*, I, ed. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín. *AOAT* 24 (1976)
KUB	*Keilschrifturkunde aus Boghazköi*, Berlin
KuD	*Kerygma und Dogma*, Göttingen
Kuhn	K. G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen, 1960); Nachträge, *RevQ* 4 (1963-64) 163-234
l(l).	line(s)
Lane	E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, 8 vols. (London, 1863-93, repr. 1968)
Lat.	Latin
LCL	*Loeb Classical Library*, Cambridge, Mass., and London
LD	*Lectio divina*, Paris

LebZeug	*Lebendiges Zeugnis,* Paderborn
Leslau, *Contributions*	W. Leslau, *Ethiopic and South Arabic Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon* (Los Angeles, 1958)
Leš	*Lešonénu,* Jerusalem
LexÄg	W. Helck and E. Otto, eds., *Lexikon der Ägyptologie* (Wiesbaden, 1975–)
LexHebAram	F. Zorrell, *Lexicon hebraicum et aramaicum Veteris Testamenti* (Rome, 1958, repr. 1968)
LexLingAeth	A. Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae aethiopicae* (Leipzig, 1865)
LexLingAram	E. Vogt, *Lexicon linguae aramaicae Veteris Testamenti documentis antiquis illustratum* (Rome, 1971)
LexSyr	C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon syriacum* (Halle, 1928, ^{2}1968)
Lisowsky	G. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz zum hebräischen AT* (Stuttgart, 1958, ^{2}1966)
lit.	literally
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, ^{9}1940)
LThK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche,* ed. M. Buchberger, 10 vols. (Freiburg, 1930-38); ed. J. Höfer and K. Rahner, 10 vols. and 3 sups. (^{2}1957-68, ^{3}1966-68)
LUÅ	*Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*
LXX	Septuagint (LXX^{A}, Codex Alexandrinus; LXX^{B}, Codex Vaticanus; LXX^{Or}, Origen; LXX^{R}, Lucianic recension; LXX$^{S[1,2]}$, Codex Sinaiticus, correctors 1, 2, etc.)
M	Masada (manuscript)
MAIBL	*Mélanges présentés par divers savants à l'Academie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres,* Paris
Mand.	Mandaic
Mandelkern	S. Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae* (Tel Aviv, 1971)
MAOG	*Mitteilungen der Altorientalistischen Gesellschaft,* Leipzig
masc.	masculine
MDAI.K	*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Abteilung Kairo,* Munich
MdD	E. S. Drower and R. Macuch, *Mandaic Dictionary* (Oxford, 1963)
Meyer	R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik,* 4 vols. (Berlin, ^{3}1966-72)
mg.	margin
MGWJ	*Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums,* Breslau
Midr.	Midrash
MIO	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung,* Berlin
Moab.	Moabite
MRS	*Mission de Ras Shamra,* Paris
ms(s).	manuscript(s)
MSL	*Materialen zum sumerischen Lexikon,* Rome
MT	Masoretic Text
MTS	*Münchener theologische Studien,* Munich
Mur	Wadi Murabbaʿat text(s)
Mus	*Muséon,* Louvain
MUSJ	*Mélanges de l'Université St.-Joseph,* Beirut
MüSt	*Münsterschwarzacher Studien*
MVÄG	*Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft,* Berlin, Leipzig
n(n).	note(s)
N	name
Nab.	Nabatean
NBSS	T. Nöldeke, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft* (Strassburg, 1910)
NCBC	*New Century Bible Commentary,* Grand Rapids and London

NEAJT	*Northeast Asia Journal of Theology,* Tokyo
NEB	*Die Neue Echter-Bibel,* Würzburg
NERT	*Near Eastern Religious Texts Relating to the OT,* ed. W. Beyerlin. *OTL* (Eng. trans. 1978)
NICOT	*The New International Commentary on the OT,* Grand Rapids
NKZ	*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift,* Erlangen, Leipzig
no(s).	number(s)
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version (New York, 1989)
NRT	*Nouvelle revue théologique,* Louvain, Paris
N.S.	new series
NSS	J. Barth, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* (^{2}1894, repr. Hildesheim, 1967)
NT	New Testament, Neues Testament, etc.
NTS	*New Testament Studies,* Cambridge
NTT	*Norsk teologisk Tidsskrift,* Oslo
obj.	object
OBO	*Orbis biblicus et orientalis,* Fribourg, Göttingen
OBT	*Overtures to Biblical Theology,* Philadelphia, Minneapolis
obv.	obverse of a papyrus or tablet
OIP	*Oriental Institute Publications,* Chicago
OL	Old Latin (OL^{S}, Fragmenta Sangallensia Prophetarum)
OLP	*Orientalia lovaniensia periodica,* Louvain
OLZ	*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig, Berlin
Or	*Orientalia,* Rome
OrAnt	*Oriens antiquus,* Rome
OSA	Old South Arabic
OT	Old Testament, Oude Testament, etc.
OTL	*The Old Testament Library,* Philadelphia, Louisville
OTS	*Oudtestamentische Studiën,* Leiden
OTWSA	*Ou testamentiese werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika,* Pretoria
p(p).	page(s)
P	Priestly source (P^{G}, Priestly *Grundschrift* ["basic material"]; P^{S}, secondary Priestly source)
Palmyr.	Palmyrene
Pap.	Papyrus
par.	parallel/and parallel passages
pass.	passive
PEFQS	*Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement,* London
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly,* London
perf.	perfect
Pes.	Pesiqta
Phil.-hist. Kl.	Philosophische-historische Klasse
Phoen.	Phoenician
PJ	*Palästinajahrbuch,* Berlin
pl(s).	plate(s)
pl.	plural
PLO	*Porta linguarum orientalium,* Wiesbaden
PN	Personal name
PNPI	J. K. Stark, *Personal Names in Palmyrene Inscriptions* (Oxford, 1971)
PNU	F. Grondähl, *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit. StPohl* 1 (1967)
POS	*Pretoria Oriental Series,* Leiden
POT	*De Prediking van het OT,* Nijkerk
prep.	preposition

PRU	*Le Palais royal d'Ugarit,* ed. C. F.-A. Schaeffer and J. Nougayrol. *MRS*
ptcp.	participle
PTMS	*Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series*
Pun.	Punic
PW	A. Pauly and G. Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft,* 6 vols. (Stuttgart, 1839-52); Sup, 11 vols. (1903-56); ser. 2, 10 vols. (1914-48)
Q	Qumran scroll (preceded by arabic numeral designating cave)
Q	*Qere*
QD	*Quaestiones disputatae,* Florence
r.	reverse (side of a tablet, coin, etc.)
R	Redactor (R^D, Deuteronomistic; R^P, Priestly; R^J, Yahwist)
R.	Rabbi
RA	*Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale,* Paris
RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum,* ed. T. Klauser (Stuttgart, 1950–)
RAI	*Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale,* Paris
RÄR	H. Bonnet, *Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1952, ^{2}1971)
RB	*Revue biblique,* Paris
REJ	*Revue des études juives,* Paris
repr.	reprint, reprinted
RES	*Répertoire d'épigraphie sémitique* (Paris, 1900–) (with number of text)
rev.	revised, revision
RevQ	*Revue de Qumrân,* Paris
RevSém	*Revue sémitique,* Paris
RGG	*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Tübingen, ^{2}1927-31, ed. H. Gunkel and L. Zscharnack, 5 vols.; ^{3}1957-65, ed. K. Galling, 6 vols.)
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses,* Strasbourg, Paris
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions,* Paris
RivB	*Rivista biblica,* Rome
RLA	*Reallexikon der Assyriologie,* ed. E. Ebeling and B. Meissner (Berlin, 1932–)
RM	*Die Religion der Menschheit,* Stuttgart
RS	Ras Shamra text
RSO	*Rivista degli studi orientali,* Rome
RSP	*Ras Shamra Parallels: The Texts from Ugarit and the Hebrew Bible,* ed. L. R. Fisher et al., I, *AnOr* 49 (1972); II, *AnOr* 50 (1975); III, *AnOr* 51 (1981)
RSPT	*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* Paris
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse,* Paris
RSV	Revised Standard Version (New York, 1946, 1952)
rto.	recto, on the obverse of a papyrus or tablet
RTP	*Revue de théologie et de philosophie,* Lausanne
RTR	*Reformed Theological Review,* Hawthorn, Australia
Sab.	Sabaic
Saf.	Safaitic
SAHG	A. Falkenstein and W. von Soden, *Sumerische und akkadische Hymnen und Gebeten* (Zurich, 1953)
Sam.	Samaritan
SANT	*Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament,* Munich
SAOC	*Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization,* Chicago
SAT	*Die Schriften des ATs im Auswald,* ed. H. Gunkel and H. Gressmann, 7 vols. (Göttingen, ^{2}1920-22)
SB	*Sources bibliques,* Paris
SBB	*Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge*

SBFLA	*Studii biblici franciscani liber annus,* Jerusalem
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	*SBL Dissertation Series,* Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
SBLMS	*SBL Monograph Series,* Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
SBLSBS	*SBL Sources for Biblical Study,* Chico, Atlanta
SBLSCS	*SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies,* Missoula, Chico, Atlanta
SBM	*Stuttgarter biblische Monographien*
SBS	*Stuttgarter Bibel-Studien*
SBT	*Studies in Biblical Theology,* London, Naperville
ScrHier	*Scripta hierosolymitana,* Jerusalem
SDAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*
SEÅ	*Svensk exegetisk Årsbok,* Lund
Sem.	Semitic
Sem	*Semitica,* Paris
ser.	series
Seux	J. M. Seux, *Epithètes royales akkadiens et sumériennes* (Paris, 1967)
SFS	*Studia Francisci Scholten memoriae dicata,* Leiden
sg.	singular
SGV	*Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften,* Tübingen
SHAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*
ShnatMiqr	*Shnaton le-miqra ule-ḥeker ha-mizraḥ ha-kadum (Shnationian Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies),* Jerusalem
SJLA	*Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity,* Leiden
SNVAO	*Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo*
Soq.	Soqoṭri
SOTSMS	Society for OT Studies Monograph Series, Cambridge
SPIB	*Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici,* Rome
SR	*Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses,* Toronto
SSAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig,* Phil.-hist. Kl.
SSN	*Studia semitica neerlandica,* Assen
ST	*Studia theologica,* Lund, Århus
St.-B.	H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch,* 6 vols. (Munich, 1922-61)
StBoT	*Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten,* Wiesbaden
STDJ	*Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah,* Leiden, Grand Rapids
StOr	*Studia orientalia,* Helsinki
StPohl	*Studia Pohl,* Rome
subj.	subject
subst.	substantive
suf.	suffix
Sum.	Sumerian
SUNT	*Studien zur Umwelt des NTs,* Göttingen
Sup	Supplement(s) (to)
s.v.	*sub voce (vocibus),* under the word(s)
SVT	*Supplements to VT,* Leiden
SWBA	*Social World of Biblical Antiquity,* Sheffield
SWJT	*Southwestern Journal of Theology,* Seminary Hill, Texas
Synt	C. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1956)
Syr.	Syriac
Syr	*Syria. Revue d'art oriental et d'archéologie,* Paris
Targ.	Targum; Targ.^{J}, Targ. Jonathan from Codex Reuchlinianus
TAVO	*Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients,* Wiesbaden

TCL	*Textes cunéiformes du Musée du Louvre,* 31 vols. (Paris, 1910-67)
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the NT,* ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, 9 vols. plus index vol. (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1964-76)
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the OT,* ed. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1974–)
TGI	K. Galling, *Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels* (Tübingen, 1950, ^{2}1968, ^{3}1979)
ThArb	*Theologische Arbeiten,* Berlin
Tham.	Thamudic
ThB	*Theologische Bücherei,* Munich
ThS	*Theologische Studien,* Zurich
ThV	*Theologische Versuche,* Berlin
Tigr.	Tigriña
TIM	*Texts in the Iraq Museum*
TLOT	*Theological Lexicon of the OT,* ed. E. Jenni and C. Westermann, 3 vols. (Eng. trans., Peabody, Mass., 1997)
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung,* Leipzig, Berlin
TM	Tell Mardikh-Ebla tablets
Tos.	Tosephta
TOTC	*Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries,* London, Downers Grove
TQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift,* Tübingen, Stuttgart
trans.	translation, translated by
TRE	*Theologische Realenzyklopädie,* ed. G. Krause, G. Müller, and H. R. Balz, 22 vols. (Berlin, 1977-92)
TRu	*Theologische Rundschau,* Tübingen
TSK	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken,* Hamburg, Gotha, Leipzig
TSSI	J. C. L. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions,* 3 vols. (Oxford, 1975-82)
TTZ	*Trierer theologische Zeitschrift*
TUAT	*Texte aus der Umwelt des ATs,* Gütersloh
TWNT	*Theologisches Wörterbuch zum NT,* ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, 10 vols. plus index (Stuttgart, 1933-79)
TynB	*Tyndale Bulletin,* London
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift,* Basel
UF	*Ugarit-Forschungen,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
Ugar.	Ugaritic
UM	C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Manual. AnOr* 35 (1955)
Univ.	University
UT	C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook. AnOr* 38 (1965, ^{2}1967)
UUÅ	*Uppsala universitets årsskrift*
v(v).	verse(s)
VAB	*Vorderasiatische Bibliothek,* 7 vols. (Leipzig, 1907-16)
VG	C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen,* 2 vols. (1908-13, repr. Hildesheim, 1961)
VT	*Vetus Testamentum,* Leiden
Vulg.	Vulgate
Wagner	M. Wagner, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch. BZAW* 96 (1966)
WbÄS	A. Erman and H. Grapow, *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache,* 6 vols. (Leipzig, 1926-31, repr. 1963)
WbMyth	*Wörterbuch der Mythologie,* ed. H. W. Haussig (Stuttgart, 1965–)
WbTigr	E. Littmann and M. Höfner, *Wörterbuch der Tigre Sprache* (Wiesbaden, 1962)
Wehr	H. Wehr, *A Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic,* ed. J. M. Cowan (Ithaca, 1961, ^{3}1971, ^{4}1979)

Whitaker	R. E. Whitaker, *A Concordance of the Ugaritic Language* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972)
WMANT	*Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament,* Neukirchen-Vluyn
WO	*Die Welt des Orients,* Göttingen
WTJ	*Westminster Theological Journal,* Philadelphia
WTM	J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim,* 4 vols. (Leipzig, ^{2}1924, repr. 1963)
WuD	*Wort und Dienst,* Bielefeld
WUNT	*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum NT,* Tübingen
WUS	J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache. BSAW,* Phil.-hist. Kl. 106/3 (1963, ^{4}1974)
WVDOG	*Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft,* Leipzig
WZ Halle	*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg,* Halle
WZKM	*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes,* Vienna
YOSR	*Yale Oriental Series: Researches,* New Haven
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie,* Leipzig, Berlin
ZÄS	*Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde,* Leipzig, Berlin
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* Giessen, Berlin
ZBK	*Zürcher Bibelkommentare,* Zurich, Stuttgart
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft,* Leipzig, Wiesbaden
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins,* Leipzig, Stuttgart, Wiesbaden
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,* Giessen, Berlin
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche,* Tübingen
→	cross-reference within this Dictionary
<	derived from
>	whence derived, to
*	theoretical form

TRANSLITERATION

VOWELS

◌ַ	a
◌ֲ	^{a}
◌ָ	ā
◌ָה	â
◌ָיו	āyw
◌ַי	ay
◌ָי	āy
◌ֶ	e
◌ֱ	^{e}
◌ֶי	ey
◌ֵ	ē
◌ֵי	ê
◌ְ	^{e}
◌ִ	i
◌ִי	î
◌ִיּ	îy
◌ָ	o
◌ֳ	^{o}
◌ֹ	ō
וֹ	ô
◌ֻ	u, ū
וּ	û

CONSONANTS

א	ʾ
בּ	b
ב	ḇ
גּ	g
ג	ḡ
דּ	d
ד	ḏ
ה, הּ	h
ו	w
ז	z
ח	ḥ
ט	ṭ
י	y
כּ	k
כ, ך	ḵ
ל	l
מ, ם	m
נ, ן	n
ס	s
ע	ʿ
פּ	p
פ, ף	p̄
צ, ץ	ṣ
ק	q
ר	r
שׂ	ś
שׁ	š
תּ	t
ת	ṯ

נָקַם nāqam; נָקָם nāqām; נְקָמָה n^eqāmâ

Contents: I. Grammar and Syntax. II. The Obligation to Take Vengeance: 1. Blood Revenge; 2. Revenge in the Case of Rape or Other Serious Transgressions; 3. Places of Asylum. III. Prohibition of Revenge: 1. Within the Clan; 2. In a Given Social Structure. IV. God as Avenger.

I. Grammar and Syntax. The verbal root *nqm*, expressing the notion of revenge, is attested in Amorite, Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, South Arabic, and Ethiopic. The verb *nqm* occurs 36 times in the Hebrew Bible in the qal, niphal, piel, and hithpael. Both the derivative substs. *nāqām* (17 occurrences) and *n^eqāmâ* (27 occurrences) mean "vengeance, revenge" and are thus synonymous with Amor. *niqmu* and Arab. *naqma, niqma, naqima.* Although the month *niqmu* is attested in the Old Babylonian epoch in Mari, Chagar Bazar, al-Rimah, and in the region of Diyala, i.e., in regions under Amorite influence, its possible relationship with *niqmu,* "vengeance," has not been substantiated.

The Hebrew verb *nāqam* in the qal means "to avenge" or "to take vengeance," often taking as its direct object the subst. *n^eqāmâ* (Nu. 31:2) or *nāqām* (Lev. 26:25; Jgs. 16:28; Ezk. 24:8; 25:12,15; CD 1:17; 1QS 2:5; 5:12). In other instances the direct object is the blood (Dt. 32:43) or the person to be avenged (1 S. 24:13[Eng. v. 12]). Although in Josh. 10:13 the direct object seems to refer to the enemies on whom one takes vengeance, this construction is unusual, and the use of the verb "to avenge" in

---

nāqam. W. F. Albright, "Archaeological Discovery and the Scriptures," *Christianity Today* 12 (1968) 3-5; M. Buttenwieser, "Blood Revenge and Burial Rites in Ancient Israel," *JAOS* 39 (1919) 301-21; G. Cardascia, "La place du talion dans l'histoire du droit pénal à la lumière des droits du Proche-Orient ancien," *Mélanges offerts à Jean Dauvillier* (Toulouse, 1979), 169-83; W. Dietrich, "Rache: Erwägungen zu einem alttestamentlichen Thema," *EvT* 36 (1976) 450-72; G. Dossin, "*NQMD* et *NIQME-ḪAD*," *Syr* 20 (1939) 169-76; F. C. Fensham, "Das Nicht-Haftbar-Sein im Bundesbuch im Lichte der altorientalischen Rechtstexte," *JNSL* 8 (1980) 17-34; F. Horst, "Recht und Religion im Bereich des ATs," *EvT* 16 (1956) 49-75 = idem, *Gottes Recht. ThB* 12 (1961) 260-91; idem, "Vergeltung," *RGG,* VI, 1343-46; K. Koch, ed., *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des ATs. WdF* 125 (1972); idem, "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im AT?" *ZTK* 52 (1955) 1-42; H. Lammens, "Le caractère religieux du *târ* ou vendetta chez les Arabes," *BIFAO* 26 (1926) 83-127; E. Lipiński, *La Royauté de Yahwé dans la poésie et le culte de l'ancien Israël* (Brussels, ^{2}1968), 289-92; G. E. Mendenhall, *The Tenth Generation* (Baltimore, 1973), 69-104; idem, "'God of Vengeance, Shine Forth!'" *Wittenberg Bulletin* 45 (1948) 37-42; E. Merz, *Die Blutrache bei den Israeliten. BWANT* 20 (1916); W. T. Pitard, "Amarna *ekemu* and Hebrew *naqam,*" *Maarav* 3 (1982) 5-25; O. Procksch, *Über die Blutrache bei den vorislamitischen Arabern* (Leipzig, 1899); H. Graf Reventlow, "'Sein Blut komme über sein Haupt,'" *VT* 10 (1960) 311-27; G. Sauer, "נקם *nqm* to avenge," *TLOT,* II, 767-69; J. H. Tullock, "Blood Vengeance Among the Israelites in the Light of Its Near Eastern Background" (diss., Vanderbilt, 1966); R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 10-12, 160-63; J. Weingreen, "The Concepts of Retaliation and Compensation in Biblical Law," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 76 C 1 (Dublin, 1976); C. Westermann, "Rache," *BHHW,* III, 1546; → גאל *gā'al* (II, 350-55).

this text is inappropriate. Instead, one should read a form of the verb *qûm* and vocalize *'aḏ-yāqûm* instead of *'aḏ-yiqqōm.* The translation would then be: "as long as the host of their enemies rose up" (cf. *gôy nēḵār* in CD 14:14). The piel of *nqm* is attested twice and used exactly like the qal, i.e., with the subst. *n^eqāmâ* (Jer. 51:36) or with the "blood" to be avenged (2 K. 9:7) as its direct object. The qal passive in Gen. 4:15,24; Ex. 21:21 means "to be avenged."

The niphal and hithpael have the reflexive sense of "to avenge oneself" or "to take vengeance," except in Ex. 21:20, where *yinnāqēm* must have the passive meaning "to be avenged," since the reference is to a slave who was beaten to death. The niphal infinitive also has a passive meaning in Sir. 46:1, where *lhnqm nqmy 'wyb* should be translated "so that the vengeance taken by the enemy be avenged." This passive construction corresponds to the active expression *nāqam nāqām.* Ex. 21:20, however, presents a series of problems. Indeed, Ex. 21:20f. seems to betray two redactional strata. The combination of the qal infinitive with the niphal imperfect, *nāqōm yinnāqēm,* is rare.[1] Furthermore, the Sam. text reads *môṯ yûmāṯ,* while the Targs. and Syr. understand this as "he shall be punished before the court." It is possible that the original text should be understood in the sense of *nôqēm yinnāqēm,* "an avenger should take vengeance," and that *nqm* niphal here has reflexive meaning.

Reference to the enemies on whom one avenges oneself is introduced by *min* (1 S. 14:24; 24:13[12]; Jgs. 16:28; 2 K. 9:7; Est. 8:13; Isa. 1:24; Jer. 15:15; 46:10; cf. Jer. 11:20; 20:10,12), *mē'ēṯ* (Nu. 31:2), *b^e* (Jgs. 15:7; 1 S. 18:25; Jer. 5:9,29; 9:8[9]; 50:15; Ezk. 25:12; cf. CD 8:11f.; 1QpHab 9:2), or *l^e* (Ezk. 25:12; Nah. 1:2; CD 8:5f.; 9:5). This last particle can also precede the name of the person for whose sake vengeance is taken (Jer. 15:15; 1QS 7:9); in one instance *min* precedes the reason one wishes to take vengeance (Jgs. 16:28). The prep. *'al* is used with similar meaning in Ps. 99:8, where it refers to Israel's deeds (*'^alîlôṯ*) that are protected by God's avenging might.

The substs. *nāqām* and *n^eqāmâ* are used with either the subjective or objective genitive, though a pronominal suffix can also be used. The subjective genitive designating the avenger usually refers to God (Nu. 31:3; Jer. 11:20; 20:12; 50:15,38; 51:11; Ezk. 25:14,17; 1QS 1:11; 1QM 4:12) or to his wrath (1QM 3:6). In Lam. 3:60; Sir. 46:1; and 1QS 2:9 it refers to the adversaries who take vengeance. It is always *nqmt* that is used, excepting Sir. 46:1, the only occurrence of the pl. *nqmy.* The objective genitive refers to the one to be avenged. This can be a person's blood (Ps. 79:10), the temple (Jer. 50:28; 51:11), Zion (Jer. 51:36), the sons of Israel (Nu. 31:2), Jeremiah's personal enemies (Jer. 20:10), or the covenant (Lev. 26:25; CD 1:17f.). Only in the last instance does one encounter the subst. *nāqām.* Amor. *niqmu* has thus far been attested only with the objective genitive (suf.): *niqmīšu, niqmī, niqmīya.*

The notion of "taking vengeance" can be expressed in various ways with the root *nqm.* In addition to *nqm,* alone or with the infinitive absolute, and the idiomatic expressions *nāqam n^eqāmâ* and *nāqam nāqām,* the following expressions occur: *hēšîḇ nāqām* (Dt. 32:41,43; Sir. 12:6), *'āśâ n^eqāmâ* (Jgs. 11:36; Ps. 149:7; Ezk. 25:17; CD 8:11-12;

---

1. Cf., however, *GK,* §113w.

1QpHab 9:2) or *'āśâ nāqām* (Mic. 5:14[15]), *lāqaḥ nᵉqāmâ* (Jer. 20:10) or *lāqaḥ nāqām* (Isa. 47:3), and *nāṯan nᵉqāmâ* (Nu. 31:3; 2 S. 4:8; 22:48; Ps. 18:48[47]; Ezk. 25:14,17). The offended party wishes to "see vengeance" (*rā'â nᵉqāmâ,* Jer. 11:20; 20:12; cf. Lam. 3:60; or *ḥāzâ nāqām,* Ps. 58:11[10]). For that person the day when vengeance is taken is in a certain sense a festive day, while the same day is a day of terror for the person on whom that vengeance is taken. This day is called *yôm nᵉqāmâ* (Jer. 46:10) or *yôm nāqām,* "day of vengeance" (Prov. 6:34; Isa. 34:8; 61:2; 63:4; 1QS 9:25; 10:19; 1QM 3:7f.; 7:5), *'ēṯ nᵉqāmâ,* "the time of vengeance" (Jer. 51:6), or *mô'ēḏ nāqām,* "date of revenge" (1QM 15:6). The month *niqmu(m)* in the Amorite calendar of the Old Babylonian period might imply a limitation of the right of vengeance to only one month during the year.

The avenger is normally called → גאל *gō'ēl,* though use of the ptcp. *nōqēm* for God as avenger and for those who carry out divine revenge (Ps. 99:8; Nah. 1:2; CD 9:4f.; 1QS 2:6) seems to indicate that this was the original expression for "avenger." This participle should perhaps also be read in Ex. 21:20 (see discussion above). The name *nāqimu(m),* "avenger," occurs as an Amorite personal name.[2] This name was possibly given to a child who was one day to take revenge on the murderer of his father or grandfather. The name *niqmānu(m)* is attested among the Amorites during the same period and might have the same derivation, since it means approximately "vengeful."[3] An unpublished Mari text calls the avenger *bēl niqmi,* lit. "master of revenge."[4]

II. The Obligation to Take Vengeance.

1. *Blood Revenge.* The obligation to take blood vengeance, *niqmaṯ dam* (Ps. 79:10), arises from the real or imagined blood kinship among the members of a clan or tribe. This is an old desert law corresponding to the *ṯa'r* of the Arabs with the goal of guaranteeing respect for life. This obligation is supported by the entirety of OT legislation: cf. the Covenant Code (Ex. 21:12), the Holiness Code (Lev. 24:17), and the Deuteronomic collection of laws (Dt. 19:11f.). As Gen. 9:6 states in rhythmic-poetic language, the blood of the person who sheds human blood must also be shed. Redemption by monetary payment is not a possibility (Nu. 35:31-34). The nearest relation is the *gō'ēl,* who is to take vengeance on the murderer (Nu. 35:19; Dt. 19:12; cf. 2 S. 14:11): A father must avenge his son, a son his father (1 K. 2:5-9; 2 K. 14:5); if a person has no children, his brother or one of his closest relatives must take this task upon himself. Thus Joab kills Abner (2 S. 3:22-27) to avenge the death of his brother Asahel (2 S. 2:22f.). The avenger must carry out the punishment "with his own hand" (*bᵉyaḏ;* cf. Ezk. 25:14; 1QS 2:6) and shed (on the ground) the blood of the murderer of his son or of one of his blood relatives. Indeed, blood vengeance can extend into the fourth generation (cf. Ex. 20:5; 34:7), though subsequent law re-

---

2. T. Bauer, *Die Ostkanaanäer* (Leipzig, 1926), 36; *APNM,* 241f.
3. Bauer, 47; *ARM,* II, 95, 5.
4. Cited by G. Dossin, *Syr* 20 (1939) 175 n. 2.

stricts blood vengeance to the murderer alone (Dt. 24:16; 2 K. 14:6 par. 2 Ch. 25:4; Jer. 31:29f.; Ezk. 18:2-4).

The law of blood revenge is intended to guarantee respect not only for the life of the freeperson but also for that of the slave (Ex. 21:20f.). If a slave, male or female, dies under the blows of his or her master, "an avenger shall avenge him [or her]" *(nōqēm yinnāqēm)*.[5] This punishment was undoubtedly death, since a comparison both with Ex. 21:18-19 and with the Sam. text, which replaces *nqm ynqm* with *môṯ yûmāṯ*, shows that the *lex talionis* must be applied here. The avenger was normally to be a member of the slave's family. If the slave was a foreigner or alien whose family was not present to carry out that vengeance, however, the murderer went unpunished. Talmudic legislation provides for such cases by prescribing the appointment of an avenger by the judicial assembly (Bab. *Sanh.* 45b), though this measure is not attested in the Bible itself and presupposes a procedure involving public law, while the law in Ex. 21:12ff. seems to give the murderer over to private vengeance.

If one excludes the hypothesis of an avenger appointed by a legal authority, the law in Ex. 21:20 still allows for two different interpretations. It may be that it applies in actual practice only to the Hebrew slave whose family genuinely is able to take vengeance. This is the most probable explanation. If in contrast it applies to every slave independent of origin, then it must also consider the possibility of immanent or divine vengeance. Perhaps one interpreted the lethal bite of a snake or a scorpion in this sense, since Nu. 21:6-7 does mention the serpent as the executor of divine punishment, and since talmudic literature portrays it as the avenger without qualification. Here we find the expression that someone "avenges himself and is as vindictive as a snake" (*nôqēm wenôṭēr kenāḥāš;* Bab. *Šabb.* 63a; *Yoma* 23a; *Ta'an.* 8a). Here Samson is characterized as "vengeful as a snake" (*kešēm še-nāḥāš naqmān; Gen. Rab.* 99). The blood of the victim cries out from the ground (Gen. 4:10), the habitation of the serpent, the archetypal chthonic animal. These later expressions of popular belief, which also mention angels as executors of vengeance,[6] do not allow us to reconstruct the exact understanding of divine vengeance, a notion possibly presupposed in Ex. 21:20f. In any event, the slave can no longer be avenged if he or she dies one or two days later rather than directly under the blows of the master. It must be clear that death was not intentional or premeditated. The master was considered sufficiently punished by the financial loss brought about by the death of the slave and the cessation of the slave's service.

The obligation to "blood revenge" can also be regulated contractually, as shown by the stelae of Sefire. According to stela III, which treats of the obligations of a vassal in the case of regicide, the vassal must "avenge the blood" (*nqm dm;* cf. Dt. 32:43; 2 K. 9:7) of the liege lord, the lord's sons, and his descendants "from the hand" (*mn* or *mn yd*) of their enemies.[7] If he himself participated in the conspiracy, someone had to avenge on him the blood of his liege lord.[8] This particular case of obligation to take

5. On this emendation see previous discussion.
6. Cf. J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls* (Jerusalem, 1985), 135, 144.
7. *KAI*, 224:11f.
8. L. 22.

vengeance on the murderer was familiar in ancient Israel, since a similar obligation derived from the covenant[9] between Yahweh and the people. And though Yahweh executes vengeance on disloyalty toward the prescriptions of the covenant (Lev. 26:25; cf. 1QS 5:12; CD 1:17-18), he also obligates himself by oath to avenge the blood of his servants (Dt. 32:40-43; cf. Ps. 79:10).

2. *Revenge in the Case of Rape or Other Serious Transgressions.* Revenge is extracted not only in the case of murder but also in the case of rape and serious bodily harm. Thus Dinah's brothers avenge their sister by killing Hamor and his son Shechem, "because their sister had been defiled" (Gen. 34:1-5,25-27). After Amnon, David's firstborn, violates his half-sister Tamar (2 S. 13:1-20), she is avenged two years later by her brother Absalom. Absalom has his servants kill Amnon, and then he flees to his maternal grandfather, the king of Geshur, with whom he remains for three years (2 S. 13:23-38; cf. 3:3). Afterward he is able to return to Jerusalem (14:21-24), since the right of blood revenge is not valid within the same familial group. The jealous husband also extracts revenge when he punishes the adulterer who has violated his marriage by lying with his wife (Prov. 6:34f.).

The story of Samson relates an example of vengeance prompted by serious physical injury. Samson avenges his blindness on the Philistines by causing a house to collapse and burying them under its ruins (Jgs. 16:28-30). Jeremiah's adversaries want to take revenge on the prophet because of his prediction, which in their eyes threatens the existence of the city (Jer. 20:10; cf. 26:11); and Jeremiah himself wishes that God would avenge him on the people (11:20; 20:12). The righteous wishes to "see vengeance" and to "bathe his feet in the blood of the wicked" who caused his suffering (Ps. 58:11[10]). Vengefulness is satisfied at the sight of revenge, which Israel's and Judah's enemies (e.g., the Edomites) also carry out (Lam. 3:60; Ezk. 25:12,15; Sir. 46:1; 1QpHab 9:2; 1QS 2:9). The Song of Lamech (Gen. 4:23-24), in which he boasts of having killed a man for wounding him, and even of being avenged seventy-sevenfold, does not reflect reality, but is rather an ancient boasting song illustrating the violence of the Cainites.[10]

3. *Places of Asylum.* The example of Joab, who kills Abner (2 S. 3:22-27; cf. 2:22f.), shows that the sacred duty of blood revenge was not soon forgotten. Thus it is understandable that legislation tried on the one hand to restrain the practice of taking revenge, though on the other hand it was quite suited to function as a preventative. Legislation regarding the cities of asylum (Nu. 35:9-34; Dt. 4:41-43; 19:1-13; Josh. 20:1-9), while sanctioning blood revenge, does distinguish cases of unintentional killing and establishes for such cases the ordinances of asylum. It establishes furthermore that only the murderer be punished by death. The texts describing this institution are difficult to interpret, and the cities of asylum (Josh. 20:1-9) are located apart from the

9. → בְּרִית *b^e^rîṯ (b^e^rîth)* (II, 253-79).

10. On the notion of "violence" in the OT see N. Lohfink et al., *Gewalt und Gewaltlosigkeit im AT. QD* 96 (1983), with extensive bibliography.

Levitical cities (Josh. 21:11,21,27,32,36,38; cf. 1 Ch. 6), as if the Levites were originally persons who had fled into the cities of refuge, where they survived under God's protection, having changed into zealots for his cult (cf. Gen. 49:5-7; Dt. 33:9).[11]

Sacred sites could also function as cities of refuge, and certain statements in the Psalms seem to allude to the temple as a place of refuge. The temple is a shelter from one's adversaries where one can remain in safety (Ps. 27:2-5) beneath the wings of Yahweh (61:4f.[3f.]), while a guilty person is denied access (5:5[4]). This is why the murderer can be torn away from the altar to be delivered over to punishment (Ex. 21:13f.). Thus also Joab, who had murdered Abner and Amasa (2 S. 3:26f.; 20:9f.; 1 K. 2:5f.), was not protected by the right to asylum and was killed in the sanctuary itself (1 K. 2:28-31).

III. Prohibition of Revenge.

1. *Within the Clan.* The prohibition of revenge is emphatically inculcated in the Holiness Code: "You shall not take vengeance *(lō'-tiqqōm)* or bear any grudge *(lō'-tiṭṭōr)* against the *b^e^nê 'amm^e^ḵā*" (Lev. 19:18). The historical interpretation of this law depends on the exact sense of *b^e^nê 'amm^e^ḵā.* Although some have taken this expression as a reference to the entire people of Israel, it is doubtful whether this accurately reflects the real meaning of the word → עם *'am,* which in v. 16aα appears in the plural. Several mss. emend this pl. *'myk* to a sg. *'mk,* and the older versions translate it as if "the people" were meant. In the meantime, the *lectio difficilior 'myk* reveals the real meaning of this expression: it might refer to the paternal "ancestors," as in Amorite, in the old prescription of Lev. 20:17, or in the expression *ne'^e^sap̱ '^e^l-'ammāyw,* "to be united with his ancestors," and *niḵraṯ mē'ammāyw,* "to be cut off from his ancestors."[12] In accordance with the original meaning of the root *rkl,* "to engage in trade," the expression *lō'-ṯēlēḵ rāḵîl b^e^'ammeyḵā* (Lev. 19:16aα) would mean "you shall not go about as a trader of your ancestors." This prohibition was probably directed against trade that violated blood bonds by attempting to circumvent the law prohibiting the auctioning of paternal property, thus transferring property outside the family circle in the way effected in Nuzi by means of pseudo-adoptions.

The word *'am* also has the same meaning "ancestors" in Lev. 19:18aα, which regulates the taking of vengeance. Furthermore, one must remember that the expression *bn 'm* in this verse is already attested in Amorite by the PN *bin-'ammi* or *bunu-'ammi*[13] (cf. Gen. 19:38) as well as by the alliance that the Bedouin of Belqah (Moab) call *bēn 'amēh.* This alliance was made only between neighboring tribes living in constant contact with one another, and was based on the solemn oath that the members of the two tribes would conduct themselves as relatives. Such an alliance lends this tribal association a stability similar to that obtaining within the family as a result of blood ties, and in the case of murder permits no vengeance within the *bēn 'amēh.* The murderer of a

---

11. → מקלט *miqlāṭ* (VIII, 552-56); → לוי *lēwî* (VII, 483-503).
12. Cf. B. Alfrink, "L'Expression נֶאֱסַף אֶל־עַמָּיו," *OTS* 5 (1948) 118-31.
13. Bauer, 15ff.; *ARM,* XVI/1, 81f.

bēn ʿam must leave his tribe along with all his direct descendants and with the three generations of the line most closely related to him. From now on he is subject to the vengeance of the victim's relatives, since he no longer enjoys the protection of a *bēn ʿamēh;* the more distant members of his family who remain in the tribe are not to be violated, and even the property of the ostracized person is untouchable.[14]

This institution enables us to understand the original sense of the prohibition of Lev. 19:18a: "You shall not take vengeance or bear any grudge against the children of your ancestors." This is a prohibition of vengeance within the familial group, though it by no means implies that a murderer should go unpunished. The punishment meted out to him is exclusion from the clan, as is the case with the fratricide Cain (Gen. 4:10-14). As Yahweh does here, so also can a Bedouin sheikh and the tribal elders exclude a dangerous member from the clan on the basis of a decision called *infirāš ʿabātih,* "shaking (out) his cloak." All the members of the camp and of the neighboring tribes are officially informed concerning this harsh decision, which subjects the individual to the mercy or disfavor of any person happening upon him. No one, neither from his tribe nor from his family, will avenge his blood if he is murdered. This is the allusion in Gen. 4:14. In the meantime, Yahweh puts a mark on Cain that he be avenged sevenfold *(yuqqām)* should anyone kill him (4:15), even though Cain is the murderer of his own brother, whose blood cries out to God from the ground (4:10f.). Gen. 4:15, however, might be a redactional verse taking the Song of Lamech (4:24) as its model. If one takes 4:15 as redactional, one can hardly conclude from it the existence of a specific institution or praxis protecting the murderer.[15]

The story of the woman of Tekoa (2 S. 14:4-11), a tale illustrating royal wisdom (cf. 1 K. 3:16-28), seems to contradict the custom of not carrying out vengeance within the same family group. According to this story, a fratricide was to be killed by the members of the clan. This case is unusual, and it is thus the task of the wise and just king to resolve it. His decision does indeed accord with custom, a fact confirming his wisdom in the eyes of the people. Furthermore, the king assures: "Not one hair" of the fratricide shall "fall to the ground." This implies that the intervention of the highest authority puts an end to the dispute.

2. *In a Given Social Structure.* The commentary of the woman of Tekoa (2 S. 14:14) resembles a wisdom reflection on the fate of the sacrificial offering for which one can do nothing more, and on that of the murderer who can yet be of use to his clan. This reflection tends in the same direction as the institution of cities of refuge and a more comprehensive interpretation of Lev. 19:18. Although the rabbinic commentaries in connection with this verse do not consider the important circumstances of murder, rape, or mutilation (Bab. *Yoma* 23a), the LXX translators might have been thinking of serious injuries, since they render *lōʾ-tiqqōm* with *ouk ekdikátaí sou hē cheír,* "that you

---

14. A. Jaussen, *Coutumes des Arabes au pays de Moab* (Paris, 1908), 149-62.

15. A different view is taken by F. W. Golka, "Keine Gnade für Kain," *Werden und Wirken des ATs. FS C. Westermann* (Göttingen, 1980), 58-73.

not take the law into your own hands," using the same verb *ekdikō* as in Ex. 21:20f. or Dt. 32:43. In other words, one must seek justice from the courts.

The Qumran Essenes go even further in their interpretation of Lev. 19:18. According to CD 9:2-5 God alone is to take vengeance on his enemies. Vengeance and rancor are viewed as transgressions against the law if a person accuses his companion without first having rebuked him before witnesses or having brought his anger under control; one would be making the same mistake if one were to accuse him "before his elders." This Essene prescription need not have any particularly grievous transgressions in mind, since the rules of the community (1QS 7:8-9) provide for a punishment of six months or a year for the transgression of bearing malice or taking revenge. One of the most essential obligations of the members of this "new covenant" consists in "not bearing rancor from one day to the next" (CD 7:2-3). God will severely punish those who "have taken revenge and borne malice" (CD 8:5-6).

IV. God as Avenger. The notion of the "avenging God" (Ps. 99:8; Nah. 1:2; CD 9:4-5), the "God of vengeance" (Ps. 94:1; 1QS 4:12), "Yahweh's vengeance" (Nu. 31:3; Jer. 11:20; 20:12; 50:15,28; 51:11; Ezk. 25:14,17), or the "vengeance of God" (1QM 4:12; 1QS 1:10f.) derives from an ancient Semitic concept already expressed in Amorite personal names consisting of the root *nqm* and a theophoric element.[16] Some of these names carry the verbal form *yaqqim* < **yanqim,* which can be interpreted as indicative or jussive. Considering that the names often express a special relationship between the believer and his or her god, and that they thus have the goal of invoking divine protection for the believer, *yaqqim* can be understood as a jussive. The deity is entreated to exercise the function of an "avenger" or "protector" of the believer. Thus one might translate the PNs *yaqqim-haddu, yaqqim-'ēl,* and *yaqqim-li'im* as "may Haddu/El/Lim avenge or vindicate." Translated thus, rather than invoking divine vengeance on a specific enemy, the names express the wish that the god might protect the newborn child throughout life. This can be seen even more clearly in the theophoric names constructed from the subst. *niqm-* (occasionally *niqmīya* with the 1st person sg. suf.), where *niqm-* is an abbreviation of *bēl niqmi,* "lord of vengeance," "avenger, vindicator." The expression occurs in a text from Mari: *bēl niqmišu idūkšu,* "his avenger has killed him"; the first *-šu* suffix refers to the person whom one avenges, the second to the person on whom one takes vengeance.[17] At least one Amorite personal name shows that the deity was viewed as the normal avenger of the believer: *(bēl-) niqmīya-haddu,* "my avenger is Haddu." Although this personal name is associated with others seemingly of the same type, these probably have a different explanation. Thus it is unclear whether a divine father is the intended avenger in the PN *(bēl-) niqmi-'abî,* "the avenger is my father." Similarly, one can ask whether *yapu'/yapa'* and *yatar* in *(bēl-) niqmi-yapu'* and *(bēl-) niqmi-yatar* constitute theophoric elements or verbal forms suggesting the translation "the avenger reveals himself" and "the avenger is stronger." The

16. I. J. Gelb, *Computer-Aided Analysis of Amorite. AS* 21 (1980), 334f.
17. G. Dossin, *Syr* 20 (1939) 175 n. 2.

reigning dynasty of Ugarit preserved the tradition of these names. The kings Niqmadd(u) and Niqmepa bear such names, even though the root *nqm* was not customary in Ugarit. Other names, rather than expressing a wish, articulate gratitude for divine intervention, allowing a family member to be considered avenged. The existence of corresponding names leaves no room for doubt, as shown by the Akkadian PN *nabû-tuktê-erība,* "Nabu has taken vengeance."[18] Such a name occurs in Ugarit, where *na-qa-ma-du,* i.e., *naqam-haddu,* means "Haddu has avenged."[19] Phoenician attests a similar PN, *nqm'l,* "El has avenged."[20]

Even if Hebrew does not offer analogous names, the OT does attest several examples of *nāqam, niqqam,* or *niqqēm* with Yahweh as the explicit or implicit subject (Dt. 32:43; 1 S. 24:13[12]; 2 K. 9:7; Isa. 1:24; Jer. 15:15; 46:10; 51:36; Ezk. 24:8). To these we may add the synonymous expressions meaning "to wreak vengeance" or "to execute vengeance" in which similarly Yahweh is the subject: *hēšîḇ nāqām* (Dt. 32:41,43; Sir 12:6), *nāṯan nᵉqāmâ* (2 S. 4:8; 22:48; Ps. 18:48[47]; Ezk. 25:14,17), *'āśâ nᵉqāmâ* (Jgs. 11:36; Ezk. 25:17; cf. Ps. 149:7), *'āśâ nāqām* (Mic. 5:14[15]), or *lāqaḥ nāqām* (Jer. 47:3). God can also send an "avenging sword" (*ḥereḇ nōqemeṯ,* Lev. 26:25; CD 1:17f.), a "vengeful avenger" (1QS 2:6), or a mighty ruler who will "wreak vengeance" (CD 8:1f.). God is seen as one who intervenes to avenge the desecrated covenant (Lev. 26:25; cf. 1QS 5:12; CD 1:17f.), Zion (Jer. 51:36), or the destroyed temple (Jer. 50:28; 51:11), as well as his people or his servants (Dt. 32:35,43; 2 K. 9:7; Ps. 79:10; Isa. 35:4; Jer. 15:15). Thus does he take vengeance on Midian (Nu. 31:2f.), the Ammonites (Jgs. 11:36), Babylon (Isa. 47:3; Jer. 50:15,28; 51:6,11,36), Edom (Isa. 34:8; Ezk. 25:12-14), the Philistines (Ezk. 25:15-17), or on the nations in general (Ps. 149:7). He avenges himself on his enemies (Dt. 32:41; Isa. 1:24; 59:17; Jer. 46:10; Nah. 1:2; Mic. 5:14[15]; CD 9:5), or for the faithlessness of Jerusalem (Ezk. 24:8). He can also intervene in personal affairs and take vengeance on Saul (1 S. 24:13[12]; 2 S. 4:8), on the psalmist's adversaries (2 S. 22:48 = Ps. 18:48[47]), or on those of Jeremiah (Jer. 11:20; 20:12). In the eschatological view of Qumran he will wreak his vengeance on the men of the lot of Belial (1QS 2:6) and on the sons of darkness (1QM 3:6). Although the specific manner of divine intervention remains undetermined in the prophetic predictions, narrative texts indicate that God employs both human beings and events. In this sense the armed men execute Yahweh's vengeance on Midian (Nu. 31:3), and Rimmon's two sons consider themselves to be the executors of divine vengeance when they behead Ishbosheth and bring his head to David (2 S. 4:7-8).

Lipiński

---

18. *AHw,* III, 1368a.
19. *PRU,* III, 196, I, 9; *PNU,* 168.
20. Benz, 363.

נָקַף nāqap̱

Contents: I. Etymology. II. 1. OT Occurrences; 2. Phraseology and Synonyms; 3. LXX; 4. Qumran. III. 1. OT Usage; 2. Sirach.

I. Etymology. The term *nqp* II represents a root not attested in East Semitic (cf. the par. *qûp*).[1] The earliest witness comes from Ugar. *nqpt,* "cycle, year."[2] Syr. *n^eqēp,* "to cling to," is comparable, as is Middle Heb. *hiqqîp* or Jewish Aram. *'aqqîp,* "to surround," Eth. *waqêf,* "bracelet," and Arab. *waqafa,* "to remain standing."

II. 1. *OT Occurrences.* The OT attests the verb once in the qal, 16 times in the hiphil (including participles; Ps. 17:9 might belong to *nqp* I, "to cut down"); mention should also be made of the substs. *niqpâ* (1 occurrence) and *t^eqûpâ* (4 occurrences). Two occurrences are in the Pentateuch, 6 in the Deuteronomistic history, 3 in the Chronicler's history, 5 in the Psalms, 2 in Job, and 1 in Lamentations; to these one may add 3 from Sirach.

2. *Phraseology and Synonyms.* The direct object is introduced 5 times by *'al* and 4 times by *'ēṯ;* no distinction in meaning can be discerned (compare 2 K. 11:8 with 2 Ch. 23:7).

The frequent parallel usage with → סבב *sāḇaḇ* (7 times) is noteworthy, *sbb* always standing in the initial position. To this are added the contextually associated *sāḇîḇ* (3 times). Other parallel expressions include *sph* and *bnh 'al* (initial position) and *šḥt* hiphil (second position). Only 4 occurrences remain in which no parallel verb is used.

Subjects include Yahweh (twice; cf. also Yahweh's wrath), persons (10 times), objects (3 times), or abstract subjects (twice, including Yahweh's wrath).

An initial overview reveals that the occurrences involving Yahweh describe an act of "surrounding" for the purpose of punishment, though this element derives from contextual factors rather than from the fundamental meaning of the word as "to surround."

3. *LXX.* The LXX uses eight words in its translation: *kykloún* (5 times; this usually constitutes the rendering of *sbb,* as attested by about 63 examples), *perikykloún* (once), *kýklos* (once), *kýklōsis* (once), *periéchein* (4 times), *perilambánein* (once), *synáptein* (once), and *synteleín* (once); to this we may add *poieín sisóēn* (once).

4. *Qumran.* Only once (1QpHab 4:7) does *nqp* hiphil appear in the Qumran writings. The construction in this instance deviates from the usual OT witnesses insofar as the indirect object is introduced by *b^e*: "they encircle them with a mighty host." While

1. See *GesTh,* 912; R. Gordis, *The Book of Job. Moreshet Series* 2 (New York, 1978), 12, who calls *nqp* "a metaplastic form of *qûp.*"
2. *WUS,* no. 1847; *UT,* no. 1700.

the causative aspect is clearly preserved, this usage constitutes a blending of the meanings of *nqp* I and II, since contextually this encirclement is carried out for the purpose of annihilation.

III. 1. *OT Usage.* The presumably earliest witness is found in Ps. 48:13(Eng. v. 12), a hymn to Zion in whose fourth section the call to a procession is issued. Walking about *(sbb)* and circling *(nqp)* Zion has religious implications insofar as Zion is Yahweh's city and the location of the temple of God (vv. 9f.). Here "age-old traditions have been applied to Jerusalem (very likely already in pre-Israelite times). There can be no doubt that mythical elements are involved";[3] bellicose connotations are not discernible. These are remnants of elements according to which the (cultic) procession guarantees power and strength.

Even though the Holiness Code in its present form derives from a relatively late period, it nonetheless preserves extremely old elements, which seem to include Lev. 19:27.[4] The prohibition against haircutting *(nqp* hiphil ["rounding off"] *pᵉ'aṯ rō'š),* based on superstitious considerations, derives from the fact that in the early period special power was attributed to one's hair (cf. Samson) and that hair was often used as a funerary offering.[5]

Isa. 29:1, a text usually taken as Isaianic, offers a cult-critical accent, since the Israelites are mockingly exhorted to let feasts continue to "run their round," a reference probably to the annually recurring festival cycle of significant celebrations. In this context the term *nqp* closely resembles Ugar. *nqpt* (year, season),[6] even though the cultic perspective should be emphasized. The durative dimension of the prefix conjugation emphasized by O. Rössler accords extremely well with the intention of the passage, since it is the repeated festivities that are being subjected to criticism.[7]

Though deriving from a later period (shortly before the exile), Josh. 6:3,11 nonetheless attest the same content for *nqp.* Once again *nqp* follows and is subordinated to the synonym *sbb.* The scene occurs in connection with the glorified portrayal of the taking of Jericho. Although one must indeed note that in many passages *sbb* refers to hostile or military encirclement (e.g., Jgs. 16:2; 20:5; 1 S. 22:18; Job 16:13; Ps. 109:3), such passages are countered by examples in which adversarial dimensions can be completely discounted (e.g., 1 K. 18:37; Ps. 26:6; 32:10), showing that context rather than the word's fundamental meaning evokes the notion of hostility, though at times the verb does approach the status of a military term. In connection with Josh. 6 we have already noted that two traditions are interwoven, one of which seems to have combative implications.[8] Verses like 3 and 11 are found in such passages; though men of war do play a part here, they are to march around the city in the manner of a processional, as

3. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 473.
4. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 254.
5. B. Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri. HKAT* I/2 (1903), 399.
6. Cf. W. G. E. Watson, "Fixed Pairs in Ugaritic and Isaiah," *VT* 22 (1972) 463.
7. "Die Präfixkonjugation Qal der Verba I^ae^ Nûn im Althebräischen und das Problem der sogenannten Tempora," *ZAW* 74 (1962) 126, 137f.
8. Cf. H. W. Hertzberg, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth. ATD* IX (⁵1974), 39f., 42.

do the priests, rather than actually into battle. This lends credence to arguments that, based among other things on the number seven, presuppose ancient traditions alluding to a divine battle evoking notions of magic and involving the anxiety and terror elicited by the numinous.[9] Worn down in this way, the city falls; poetic elaboration then describes the walls themselves collapsing.

The prophetic legend in 2 K. 6:8-23, which acquired its present form only around the time of the exile, states that Syrian soldiers surrounded *(nqp)* a city in which Elisha was staying. The same circumstance is rendered in v. 15 by *sbb*. While in this instance *nqp* is used in an implicitly hostile context, in 2 K. 11:8 (also situated within a multi-layered text)[10] *nqp* is used with *sāḇîḇ* in connection with a protective function involving temple guards: The underage heir apparent Joash is to be protected against Athaliah's officers. In the par. 2 Ch. 23:7 it is temple officials who are to prevent the king from inappropriately entering the holy precinct.[11]

M. Noth suggests that 1 K. 7:24 (cf. the par. 2 Ch. 4:3) represents an excerpt from an old register.[12] If this is the case, the witness according to which the bronze sea was decorated round about *(nqp* [hiphil] . . . *sāḇîḇ)* with art work would be quite old. In contrast, this passage is eliminated as an older witness for *nqp* if one accepts the thesis that the remark "they compassed the sea round about" constitutes a gloss to v. 24a.[13] In any event, 2 Ch. 4:3 attests the text in 1 Kings.

Isa. 15:1-9, a passage dating probably from the later monarchy, describes the spread of the cry of woe throughout Moab by using *nqp* hiphil in 15:8. The causative function of the hiphil comes to expression in its original import in this notion of sweeping dissemination (in the sense of dynamic forward movement rather than encirclement).[14]

Although Ps. 22:17(16) might be dated in the postexilic period,[15] some scholars consider it impossible to date. The portrayal of distress shows that a company of evildoers encircles the petitioner. Again, *sbb* is synonymously complemented. V. 17a(16a) describes the adversaries as a pack of dogs roaming about the mortally threatened petitioner, ready to tear the cadaver to pieces.[16] In Job 1:5 the question whether the subject of *hiqqîpû* is Job's children or the "days of the feast" should be decided in favor of the second possibility.[17] It is extremely doubtful, however, whether the reference is to a

---

9. J. Bright, "Joshua," *IB*, II (1953), 578. On the ancient traditions see J. M. Miller and G. M. Tucker, *The Book of Joshua. CBC* (1974), 54f.

10. Cf. M. Rehm, *Das zweite Buch der Könige* (Würzburg, 1982), 114.

11. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* I/21 (1955), 271.

12. *Könige (1–16). BK* IX/1 (^{2}1983), 147f.

13. So E. Würthwein, *Das erste Buch der Könige 1–16. ATD* XI/1 (1976), 77 n. 1.

14. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1997), 109.

15. Cf. C. A. Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms. ICC*, 2 vols. (1906), I, 191.

16. Cf. O. Keel et al., *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel* (Zurich/Cologne/Göttingen, 1984), I, 108f.

17. For the former see S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job. ICC* (1921), II, 25. For the latter see G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 70 n. 5.

festival at year's end or even to ongoing, excessive celebration.[18] One can correctly note that there is no suggestion of debauchery.[19] The hiphil of *nqp* points out rather that the festival period has come to an end (has come full circle, as it were; the causative may have maintained its function here). Lam. 3:5 takes us back to the collapse of the exile. In the second line of the three-part strophe beginning with *bēṯ*, the terms *bnh ʿal* and *nqp* parallel one another. The point is that Yahweh himself drastically diminished the fullness of existence (*billâ bᵉśārî*, v. 4), so threatening the petitioner that he wastes away as if among the dead (v. 6). The objection has been lodged against v. 5 that while the first substantive refers to a concrete entity, the second refers to an abstraction, which seems unacceptable.[20]

In addition to mitigating interpretations for *rōʾš* as bitterness, other emendations have also been suggested.[21] F. Praetorius, W. Rudolph, and *BHS* (with reference to the LXX) remain close to the MT.[22] This reading, which corrects only *y* and *w* as scribal errors, addresses the fact that all the substantives associated with the petitioner in vv. 4-6 are accompanied by "my." The hiphil of *nqp* fits seamlessly here, since the direct object is not always, and the indirect object is never, introduced separately. The sentence reads accordingly: "He [God] envelops my head with tribulation [exhaustion]." The remaining problem is that *bnh ʿal* is usually found in connection with war (Dt. 20:20; Eccl. 9:14; Ezk. 4:2; the metaphorical usage in Cant. 8:9 can also be adduced here).

Given the previously discussed usage of *nqp*, one cannot understand the verb as a military term, but rather must assume the presence of ongoing parallelism describing the consequences of such a threat to one's existence.

The presumably postexilic text Job 19:6 is of interest because v. 26 uses *nqp* I, which one might consider a stylistic device. Again, Yahweh is the subject, and again the reference is to hostile attack. God is portrayed as a hunter who "closed his net about me." Portrayals in which a god captures his enemies with a net are attested quite early in the ancient Near East (cf. Marduk spreading out his net to enfold the monster Tiamat and the "Net Cylinder" of Entemena).[23] In this context the word *nqp* expresses the notion of being enfolded on all sides.

In Ps. 88:17f.(16f.) Yahweh's expressions of anger and the attendant terrors are the subject of *nqp*. The verbs *sbb* and *nqp* describe the threat that comes in round about from all sides like a rising flood. In this case the aspect of hostility inheres in the context rather than in the verbs themselves.

---

18. For the former see N. H. Tur-Sinai, *The Book of Job* (Jerusalem, 1967), 17f., with reference to the Ugaritic connection. For the latter see G. Hölscher, *Das Buch Hiob. HAT* I/17 (²1952), 13.

19. F. Hesse, *Hiob. ZBK* XIV (1977), 25f.

20. D. R. Hillers, *Lamentations. AB* 7A (1972), 54.

21. For "bitterness" see H.-J. Kraus, *Klagelieder (Threni). BK* XX (⁴1983), 52. For the others see, e.g., *BHK*³.

22. Praetorius, "Threni III, 5. 16," *ZAW* 15 (1895) 326; Rudolph, "Der Text der Klagelieder," *ZAW* 56 (1938) 110.

23. For the former see *ANET*, 67. For the latter see the reference in M. H. Pope, *Job. AB* 15 (³1973), 141.

2. *Sirach.* The difficulty of the reading in Sir. 43:12 according to ms. B (*ḥôq* or the marginal reading *hôḏ*) militates for following the Masada text,[24] since God encompasses or "encircles" *(hiqqîpâ)* the vault of heaven (*ḥûg;* cf. Job 22:14). In Sir. 45:9 *nqp* hiphil describes the adornment bordering the priestly garments.[25] The terms *sbb* and *nqp* are also parallel in 50:12; the content, according to which (in metaphorical portrayal) the sons surround the high priest, does not deviate semantically from the earlier tradition.

Reiterer

24. Cf. G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach. JSHRZ* III/5 (1981), 612.
25. Cf. F. V. Reiterer, *"Urtext" und Übersetzungen. ATS* 12 (1980), 156f.

נֵר *nēr;* נִיר *nîr*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. Personal Names. II. In the OT: 1. In House and Tent; 2. In the Sanctuary; 3. Metaphorical Usage; 4. David; 5. Yahweh. III. LXX and Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.*

a. *The Root nwr.* The term *nēr,* "light, lamp," is a nominal construction deriving from the common Semitic root *nwr* or *nyr,* whose original form *nawir* contracted to *nēr.* The root derives from the base *nr,* which developed in various ways. In Hebrew it is preserved only in nominal derivatives. The verb → נהר *nāhar,* "to shine," constitutes the form of the root "expanded by the nonetymological *h,*"[1] as preserved in Aramaic. The subst. *nîr,* "light, lamp," differs in orthography from *nēr.* Yet a further homonym *nîr* is usually understood to mean "ground newly broken."[2] The term → מנורה *m*^e^*nôrâ,* "lampstand," also derives from the root *nwr,* "to shine," which is not attested as a verb in the OT. Several personal names are also constructed with *nēr.*[3]

nēr. S. Aalen, *Die Begriffe "Licht" und "Finsternis" im AT, im Spätjudentum und im Rabbinismus. SNVAO* (1951); K. Galling, "Die Beleuchtungsgeräte im israelitisch-jüdischen Kulturgebiet," *ZDPV* 46 (1923) 1-50; M. Görg, "Ein 'Machtzeichen' Davids 1 Könige XI 36," *VT,* 35 (1985), 363-68; P. D. Hanson, "The Song of Heshbon and David's *NÎR,*" *HTR* 61 (1968) 297-320; A. van der Kooij, "David, 'het licht van israel,'" *Vruchten van de uithof. FS H. A. Brongers* (Utrecht, 1974), 49-57; W. Michaelis, "λύχνος, λυχνία," *TDNT,* IV, 324-27; H. P. Rüger, "Lampe," *BHHW,* II, 1046f.; H. Weippert, "Lampe," *BRL*², 198-201.

1. Wagner, 81.
2. But see I.1.b below.
3. See I.3 below.

Akkadian attests the root in the form *nawāru/namāru,* "to be or become bright, to shine," to which can be added the noun *nūru,* "light, brightness."[4] The differentiations discernible in Hebrew appear to be reflected in Ugaritic even in orthography. Thus aside from the verbal forms of the root *nw/yr* in the sense of "to shine,"[5] we also encounter a masc. noun *nr,* "light, lamp," e.g., *kd šmn lnr ilm,* "a jar of oil for the lamp of the gods,"[6] next to the word *nyr* in a similar sense: *yrḫ nyr šmm,* "Yrḫ, the illuminator of heaven"[7] (Sir. 43:7 also refers to the moon as *nr,* "lamp"), or the fem. construction *nrt,* e.g., *nrt ilm špš,* "the lamp of the gods, *Špš*"[8] (cf. Sir. 39:17, where Syr. reads *nr* in connection with the sun). Aramaic can be represented by Syr. *nûrā',* "fire, brand,"[9] Mand. *nura,* "fire,"[10] Biblical Aram. *nûr,* "fire," in Dnl. 3 (14 times) and 7:9f., as well as by Jewish Aramaic witnesses for *nûrā'* in Midrash and Targs. The root occurs in Arabic in the nouns *nūr,* "light," *nār,* "fire," and *naur,* "blossom."[11] S. Fraenkel reckons Arab. *manārat,* "lampstand," among the Aramaic loanwords in Arabic.[12] But since both the root and the form are common in Arabic, and since OSA *mnwrt* can also be adduced, Arab. *manārat* seems instead to represent a genuinely Arabic construction, while Eth. *manārat* is a loanword from the Arabic.[13] The word read on the one hand as *mnr* in a Liḥyanite inscription and interpreted as the name of a month has on the other hand been read by A. F. L. Beeston as *wšd,* thus eliminating it as a witness for the root *nwr.*[14]

The root occurs in Old South Arabic not only in the Minaean form already mentioned, *mnwrt,* in the sense of "laying a fire,"[15] but also in the Minaean month name *ḏnwr,* evoking either a cultic situation involving the altar fire,[16] or light and fire in the sense of heat. In Sabaean the fourth stem of the root *nwr* is attested quite often as *hnr,*

4. For the former see *AHw,* II, 768b-70a; *CAD,* XI/1, 209b-18b. For the latter see *AHw,* II, 805; *CAD,* XI/2, 347b-51a.

5. *WUS,* no. 1850.

6. *KTU,* 4.284, 6.

7. *KTU,* 1.24, 31; cf. W. Herrmann, *Yariḫ und Nikkal und der Preis der Kuṯarāt-Göttinnen. BZAW* 106 (1968), 11.

8. *KTU,* 1.6 I, 8f.

9. *LexSyr,* 421b.

10. *MdD,* 294b.

11. Lane, I, 8, 2865; cf. also P. Fronzaroli, "Studi sul lessico comune semitico: III/IV: I fenomeni naturali. La religione," *AANLR* 20 (1965) 138, 144.

12. *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen* (Leiden, 1886), 270.

13. Cf. D. H. Müller, *WZKM* 1 (1887), 30. For Old South Arabic see *RES,* 2869, 5. Cf. W. Leslau, "Arabic Loan-Words in Geez," *JSS* 3 (1958) 164.

14. For the former see A. J. Jaussen, *Mission archéologique en Arabie. Société des fouilles archéologiques* 2 (Paris, 1909), no. 71, 5. For the latter see Beeston, *Proceedings of the Sixth Seminar for Arabian Studies* (1973), 69.

15. *RES,* 2869, 5. Cf. W. W. Müller, *Die Wurzeln mediae und tertiae y/w im Altsüdarabischen* (diss., Tübingen, 1962), 107. A different view is taken by M. ʿA. Ghul, "New Qatabāni Inscriptions," *BSOAS* 22 (1959) 20.

16. *RES,* 3458, 7; so A. F. L. Beeston, *Epigraphic South Arabian Calendars and Dating* (London, 1956), 16; cf. also M. Höfner, "Die altsüdarabischen Monatsnamen," *Vorderasiatische Studien. FS V. Christian* (Vienna, 1956), 53.

"to light a fire (of burnt offering to God)."[17] Biella renders *mnrt* as "altar (for burnt sacrifice?),"[18] whereas the *Sabaic Dictionary,* given the uncertain context, does not risk a definition. Finally, the root also appears in personal names.[19] In Mehri the expression *kebkîb nuwîr* is used as a reference to the star of Venus.[20]

Ethiopic also attests a root *nwr.* W. Gesenius concluded that Eth. *'anwara* with the meaning "to reprimand, disapprove, accuse, shame," derives from the original meaning "to illuminate," just as Heb. *hizhîr,* "to warn, caution," is related to the root *zhr,* "to illuminate," or Aram. *n^e^har* can mean both "to illuminate" and "to inform or instruct thoroughly."[21] In the case of *zhr,* however, we are dealing with two different, albeit homonymous roots, and Aram. *n^e^har* "to illuminate" and "to instruct" are semantically very close. Scholars as early as A. Dillmann voiced their doubts concerning the etymological derivation of Eth. *nawara* suggested by Gesenius, though even he does not completely discount the possibility of a connection with the root *nwr.*[22] One must presumably[23] take the fundamental meaning of *'anwara* to be "to brand with a mark," so that *nawr,* "mark of shame"[24] (cf. also Amhar. *näwr* and Tigr. *näwri*), was originally a branding mark. Native-language lexicons distinguish two roots: on the one hand *nōra,* "to be tainted, disgraceful" (cf. Arab. *nāwara,* "to revile"), and on the other hand *nwr* in the G stem *nawara* and in the D stem *nawwara,* "to be lighted, illuminated," deriving from Arab. *nūr* or *nār.*[25]

b. *nîr.* At least 3 passages (Prov. 13:23; Jer. 4:3; Hos. 10:12) employ what is generally taken as a homonymous word *nîr* with the meaning "newly broken ground, fallow field." The only etymological clue is Akk. *nīru,* "yoke, crosspiece,"[26] which was borrowed by Aramaic as *nîrā*[27] (also Mand. *nira,* "yoke,"[28] and as an Aramaic loanword in Arab. *nîr,* "double yoke"[29]). The semantic route leading from "yoke" to "fallow field," however, seems a bit too distant to support the alleged kinship between the two words. E. König virtually excludes any relationship between "newly broken ground" and "yoke," "since during normal plowing draught animals also had yokes."[30] In contrast, he views *nîr,* "newly broken ground," as belonging to the root *nwr,* "to be light," in the sense of "bringing the lower layers of earth to light, thus creating newly broken land." A. Guillaume's suggestion that we compare Heb. *nîr* with Arab. *bûr,* "fallow

---

17. Cf. Beeston, 101; Biella, 298; *RES,* 4906, 2, and elsewhere.
18. *CIH,* 276, 2.
19. Cf. I.3 below.
20. Cf. W. Müller, *Wurzeln,* 107.
21. *GesTh,* 408.
22. *LexLingAeth,* 671.
23. Cf. G. R. Driver, "Problems in the Hebrew Text of Proverbs," *Bibl* 32 (1951) 185.
24. Dillmann, *LexLingAeth,* 671f.: *macula, labes, vitium.*
25. Personal reference from W. W. Müller, Marburg.
26. *AHw,* II, 793b-94a; *CAD,* XI/2, 260a-64b.
27. *LexSyr,* 428a.
28. *MdD,* 299b.
29. Fraenkel, *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter,* 131.
30. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1910; [6,7]1937), 276b.

ground," does not help either.[31] In any event, in Ugaritic the form *nrt* is attested by the context *ksm,* "spelt," in the sense of field or newly broken ground.[32] The meaning "newly broken ground, fallow field" in the OT has in part been passed down by the early versions (Hos. 10:12 Vulg.; Jer. 4:3 LXX and Vulg.; Prov. 13:23 Vulg.: *novalis — neṓma*).

When Hosea (10:12) "employs the notion of newly broken ground, i.e., of the creation of new agricultural land by cultivation, he adroitly combines the imagery of land acquisition and the urgent call to his contemporary listeners concerning the matter at hand: The point is to bring about a completely new orientation."[33] One can hardly speak here of "fallow ground of knowledge"[34] (because the LXX and Targs. seem to presupposes *daʿaṯ*), since the metaphor of newly broken ground was not acknowledged by the LXX (and Syr.), receiving rather the translation "light for yourselves a lamp of knowledge." Jeremiah (4:3) employs the agricultural metaphor of fallow ground somewhat differently to point out that seed can sprout only if it is not sown among thorns, and only if the ground is tilled anew; the radical transformation of one's heart is the only true atonement. The sense of Prov. 13:23 presents enormous difficulties: "The fallow ground of the poor yields much food, but another is swept away through injustice." Since fallow ground does not normally yield rich harvest immediately, and since the poor person does not represent any "ideal" extolled by the poets of Proverbs, the interpretation of this passage is burdened from the beginning. "Perhaps this verse is saying that even the meager, untilled ground left over for the poor bears enough food as a result of God's steadfast concern, but that human injustice disrupts God's natural order such that want and distress result."[35] The word *nîr* should probably also be understood in Prov. 21:4b (despite numerous mss. and early versions with the pointing *nēr*) in the sense of "fallow ground." Since, however, the line belonging to 21:4b is apparently missing, the question is idle whether one should translate "the fallow ground" or "the lamp of the wicked is sin."

M. Noth has tried to equate the word *nîr* in 1 K. 11:36 (where according to the usual interpretation David is always to have a *nîr,* i.e., a lamp in the sense of descendants, before Yahweh in Jerusalem) with *nîr,* "fallow ground," in Hos. 10:12 and Jer. 4:3.[36] One would then translate 1 K. 11:36: "So that David my servant may always have [the possibility] of 'newly broken ground' [i.e., of a new beginning] before me in Jerusalem." Since Noth himself returned in his comm. on the books of Kings to the usual translation, however, it is appropriate to understand *nîr* in the sense of "fallow, newly broken ground, newly tilled land," only in Hos. 10:12; Jer. 4:3; and probably Prov. 13:23.[37]

---

31. "Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography," *Abr-Nahrain* 2 (1962) 25.
32. *KTU,* 1.16 III, 10.
33. J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* 24/1 (1983), 136.
34. So H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans., 1974), 180, 186.
35. So H. Ringgren, *Sprüche. ATD* 16/1 (^{3}1980), 58.
36. "Jerusalem und die israelitische Tradition," *OTS* 8 (1950) 36 = *GSAT. ThB* 6 (^{3}1966), 179. Cf. II.4 below.
37. *Könige (1–16). BK* IX/1 (^{2}1983), 243f., 261.

2. *Occurrences.* The term *nēr* occurs altogether 44 times in the OT, including 17 times in P (always in the plural except in Lev. 24:2 par. Ex. 27:20). In addition to the usual orthography *nr* the form *nyr* also appears once (2 S. 22:29). The plural is attested only as a feminine construction ending in *-ôṯ,* i.e., *nērôṯ,* and refers to "a multiplicity conceived as consisting of individual specimens."[38] To these can be added 4 occurrences (1 K. 11:36; 15:4; 2 K. 8:19; 2 Ch. 21:7) of *nîr* in the sense of "lamp, light," in reference to enduring stability or permanence, as well as *nir* in Prov. 21:4.[39] One can ask whether the differentiation between *nēr* and *nîr* can be traced back to a semantic distinction admittedly now hardly discernible, whether the differing orthography reflects dialect differences, or whether with the plene orthography *nîr* the Masoretes intended to draw attention to the fact that the reference in this case is always to the enduring existence of the Davidic dynasty.

P. D. Hanson does not consider *nîr* to be a secondary form of *nēr,* and interprets it rather on the basis of Nu. 21:30 with reference to Akk. *nīru* in the sense of dominion. According to Hanson, Akk. *nīru* acquires the sense of "dominion of the king over a conquered people or his sovereignty over his own subjects" and "the suzerain's harsh subjugation of an intractable vassal, or his benign rule over obedient subjects."[40] He suggests further that in the OT Assyr. *nīru* as a technical term associated with the vocabulary of dominion passed by way of various stages of reception in the northern kingdom (Ahijah of Shiloh, 1 K. 11:29-39; the Heshbon song, Nu. 21:30) into the south as well, and ultimately into the vocabulary of the Deuteronomist (cf. 1 K. 11:36; 15:4; 2 K. 8:19 par. 2 Ch. 21:7). Hanson also interprets 2 S. 21:17; Ps. 132:17; and Prov. 21:4 in this sense. On the other hand, M. Görg points out that Egyp. *nr,* "power, might," can throw light on the etymology of *nîr.* In Hebrew it may be that both the meaning of Assyr. *nīru* and that of Egyp. *nr* may have coalesced semantically into an individual concept. "When the Deuteronomist, positively inclined toward Judah as he was, introduced this expression, he could interpret the 'yoke of dominion' as a 'symbol of power' representing the tribe Judah as 'David's scepter.'"

The remaining 27 occurrences of *nēr* are distributed throughout the OT, though Proverbs stands out with 6 occurrences (6:23; 13:9; 20:20,27; 24:20, and 31:18), as do the Psalms and Job with 3 each (Pss. 18:29[Eng. v. 28]; 119:105; 132:17; Job 18:6; 21:17; 29:3) and Chronicles with 7 (including *nēr* 3 times in the single verse 1 Ch. 28:15; besides this also 2 Ch. 4:20,21; 13:11; 29:7). The remaining occurrences include 1 S. 3:3; 2 S. 21:17; 22:29; 1 K. 7:49; Jer. 25:10; Zeph. 1:12; and Zec. 4:2 (twice). Finally, *nr* also occurs 3 times in Sirach (26:17a ms. C; 43:7b and 50:18b ms. B). It does not occur in Genesis, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, 2 Kings, Isaiah, or Ezekiel, nor in the Minor Prophets (with the exception of Zephaniah and Zechariah) or the Megilloth. It is extremely doubtful that *sanwērîm,* "blindness" (Gen. 19:11; 2 K. 8:18; Isa. 61:1 conj.) has anything to do with the root *nwr.*[41]

---

38. D. Michel, *Grundlegung einer hebräischen Syntax* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1977), I, 35, 40.
39. See, respectively, II.4 below; I.1.b above.
40. P. 312. See *AHw,* II, 794.
41. Cf. F. Rundgren, "סַנְוֵרִים Gen 19,11; 2 Reg 6,18," *AcOr* 21 (1953) 325-31; and

3. *Personal Names. Nēr* is the name of the father of Kish (1 Ch. 8:33; 9:36) and of the father of Saul's cousin and commander Abner, whose name *'aḇnēr* or *'ᵃḇînēr* (1 S. 14:50 et passim) uses the element *nēr* as its second component. The term *nēr* constitutes the first component in *nērîyâ* or *nērîyāhû*, the name of Baruch's father (Jer. 32:12,16 *et passim*) and of Seraiah's father (Jer. 51:59), a name also well attested in extrabiblical sources.[42] Personal names constructed with *nr* or *nwr* are relatively widespread in Semitic onomastica; cf., e.g., Akk. *ᵈPN-nūri;*[43] Ugar. *'mnr, nryn, nrn;*[44] Ammonite *mnr* on a seal;[45] Pun. *b'lnr;*[46] Palm. *nwrbl, nwry, nwr'th, 'tnwry;*[47] Saf. *nr, nr'l, zbnr;* Tham. *nwr, nr, ḏblnr;* OSA *mnwr, ḏzbnr, ḏbnnr;*[48] Arab. *nawār.*[49] One is tempted to understand the element *nr* or *nwr* in these names as a theophoric component attesting the presence of a deity *nr* in the Semitic pantheon.[50] A good example would be *WUS,* no. 1852, where *nr* is enumerated as a divine name in a list of gods. As it turns out, however, the text reads *knr,* "the divine lyre of the cultic music," rather than *nr.*[51] Furthermore, despite A. Dupont-Sommer, the fact that *nr* appears in an enumeration of gods in the Aramaic inscription of Sefire may not be adduced as a witness to the presence of an independent deity *nr,* since this constitutes a "secondary deification of the concept *nūru,* 'light, lamp,' referring to the spouse of Shamash, namely, Aya."[52] Nevertheless, H. Donner poses the question whether Hebrew personal names constructed with *nr* "are not based on an unnamed but concrete deity whose actual or imagined relationship to light allowed substitution of the element נֵר."[53] Thus the interpretation presented by Noth is still possible, namely, that these names actually represent "names of trust and confidence" in which *nēr* is used as a metaphor for happiness and good fortune.[54]

A. Ahuvya, "On the Meaning of the Word סַנְוֵרִים (Gen 19,11; 2 Reg 6,18)," *Tarbiz* 39 (1970) 90-92.

42. Lachish ostracon 1:5; Arad ostracon 31:4; on a vessel inscription from Tell Beer-sheba, cf. Y. Aharoni, "Tel Beersheva," *RB* 79 (1972) 592; and on seals, cf. F. Vattioni, "I sigilli ebraici," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 357ff., nos. 19, 50, 56.

43. *AN,* §29, 1c; also *APNM,* 243f.

44. *PNU,* 165f.

45. P. Lemaire, "Nouveaux Sceaux Hébreux, Araméens et Ammonites," *Sem* 26 (1976) 62f.

46. Benz, 96, 363.

47. *PNPI,* 39, 46.

48. G. Lankester Harding, *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions* (Toronto, 1971), 585, 603, 295; and W. Müller, *Wurzeln,* 107.

49. W. Caskel, *Ǧamharat an-Nasab: Das genealogische Werk des Hišām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī* (Leiden, 1966), II, 447; additional varying constructions can be found in J. J. Hess, *Beduinennamen aus Zentralarabien. SHAW* (1912/19), 51; and in W. M. Slane, *Vocabulaire des noms des indigènes de l'Algérie* (Paris, 1868; Algiers, 1883), passim.

50. Cf. M. Höfner, "Nār (Nūr), Nā'ir," *WbMyth,* I, 457.

51. *KTU,* 1.47, 32; H. Gese, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. Die Religionen der Menschheit* 10/2 (1970), 169.

52. H. Donner, *KAI,* II, 245, on Sefire I A, 9. Cf. Dupont-Sommer, *MAIBL* 15 (1958) 32; A. Lemaire and J. M. Durand, *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré* (Paris, 1984), 170.

53. "נֵר (in Inscr. Safîrâh Aa 19)," *AfO* 18 (1957/58) 390-92.

54. *IPN,* 167f.

The place-name *ynr* preserved in Punic,[55] which can be associated with the root *nwr* and interpreted as "fire island," has a parallel on the Arabian peninsula: Al-Hamdānī, al-Iklīl VIII mentions in Yemen a certain Ğabal Yanūr, evidence perhaps of former volcanic activity.[56]

II. In the OT.

1. *In House and Tent.* Clay lamps preserved since the Middle Bronze Age show how lamps were constructed. Although they initially had the form of an open, round shell or saucer, a small furrow or spout was later added to the rim for the wick. As these spouts were enlarged, a flat foot was added to the saucers. Finally, the saucer sides were folded together so that it had two openings: one for the wick (which was made of flax fibers, *pištâ,* Isa. 42:3; 43:17), and one in the middle into which one could refill oil. In the Hellenistic and especially the Roman-Byzantine period the closed lamps were produced with the aid of molds, and were in part elaborately decorated. For the sake of more efficient lighting one placed the lamp as high as possible on a lampstand (cf. Mk. 4:21), which is why the furnishings of a guest room included, in addition to a bed, table, and chair, a lampstand upon which the lamp could be secured (2 K. 4:10); in contrast, in a tent the lamp hung high underneath the tent roof (cf. the reference *ʿālāw,* Job 18:6; 29:3). As is yet the custom among Bedouins today who want to ward off demons, the light of the lamp probably burned while a person slept. The lamp can also be of use during the day, e.g., when a small object such as a coin (Lk. 15:8) is being sought in the house; lamps must also be fetched when something is being sought in the city (Zeph. 1:12).

2. *In the Sanctuary.* According to 1 K. 7:49 par. 2 Ch. 4:7 (cf. 1 Ch. 28:15, according to which these were golden and silver lampstands) there were altogether ten lampstands in Solomon's temple, five standing to the left in the temple and five to the right (cf. also the plural in Jer. 52:19), though it is not said how many lamps each lampstand held.[57] It is unlikely that the lamps also were made of gold and silver, as suggested by 1 Ch. 28:15. The formulation *kaʿᵃḇôḏaṯ mᵉnôrâ ûmᵉnôrâ* (1 Ch. 28:15) seems to indicate that the lampstands served different purposes and thus differed in size.[58] When 2 Ch. 13:11 again speaks of only a single lampstand in the temple, this shows that the Chronicler is thinking of the postexilic seven-branched lampstand, whose lamps (according to 2 Ch. 13:11) were regularly lighted by the priests. In Hezekiah's discourse (2 Ch. 29:7) one of the first abuses criticized is that the lamps in the temple had been extinguished. Even though the OT evidence (Lev. 24:3 par. Ex. 27:21: "from evening to morning"; 2 Ch. 13:11: "and care that the lamps may burn every evening") indicates only that the lamps of the lampstand burned during the night (cf. also

55. *CIS,* 267, 4.

56. Ed. M. al-Akwaʿ, 135, 4. Personal reference from W. W. Müller, Marburg.

57. Cf. C. L. Meyers, "Was There a Seven-Branched Lampstand in Solomon's Temple?" *BAR* 5/5 (1979) 46-57.

58. So W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* I/21 (1955), 189.

1 S. 3:3 concerning Shiloh), the fact that the sanctuary (according to the portrayal in P as well as in 1 K. 6) was windowless and thus dark even by day, as well as various indications in rabbinic tradition (Mish. *Tamid* 3.10; 6.1), allows the conclusion that at least one lamp burned during the day as well.

The text concerning the production of the lampstand (Ex. 25:31-40, a text lacking unity) and the attendant account (P) of its actual production (Ex. 37:17-24) indicate that the lampstand was to made of gold, and that on its six branches and central shaft it bore altogether seven lamps. Nothing is said about the material used for the seven lamps (Ex. 25:37), so one must probably assume they were made of clay.[59] This lampstand represents a preliminary form of the seven-branched lampstand familiar from the relief of the Arch of Titus. The lamps were to be set up so as to give light upon the space in front of the lampstand itself (cf. Ex. 25:37b; 39:37 and Nu. 8:2). Josephus (*Ant.* 3.7.7 §182; *B.J.* 5.5 §217) and Philo (*Vit. Mos.* 2.21 §§102f.) associate the seven lamps with the number of planets.

Both Lev. 24:1-4 and Ex. 27:20f. (secondarily copied from Leviticus) address the problem of supplying the lampstand with the best oil, and portray a different vessel than that in Ex. 25:31ff. par. 37:17ff. Only one lamp is mentioned that is to be placed on the lampstand (peculiarly called a *mā'ôr* here). If *nēr* is not understood as a collective here (there is no reason to do so), the reference is probably to a form of lampstand corresponding perhaps to the vessel described in Zec. 4:2, one which, similar to the two sets of five simple lampstands in the preexilic temple (1 K. 7:49), had only one lamp.[60]

3. *Metaphorical Usage.* Just as light serves as a metaphor for happiness and good fortune, prosperity and well-being, so also can the lamp in its function as a giver of light be used metaphorically in this sense; indeed, *nēr* parallels *'ôr* in Job 18:6; 29:3; Ps. 119:105; Prov. 6:23; 13:9. In its praise of the good wife, Prov. 31:18 points out that this woman's lamp does not go out even at night, not because she keeps working at night, but because her undertakings are profitable such that she can afford not to extinguish it at night. When burning brightly, the lamp means good fortune in life; if it goes out, it means death and demise. The extinguishing of such a lamp[61] symbolizes misfortune and demise, since darkness resembles death and conceals its terrors.

Hence profuse archaeological evidence has been found for lamps in tombs. The burning lamp was understood as a symbol for the continuation of the family or clan.

Prov. 13:9 reads: "The light of the righteous burns brightly, but the lamp of the wicked will be put out." Prov. 20:20 says similarly: "If one curses his father or his mother, his lamp will be put out at the onset[62] of darkness," pointing out metaphorically that a bad son will fall into misfortune (cf. also Prov. 24:20: "for the evil man has no future; the lamp of the wicked will be put out"). In this sense Job 18:5f. also asserts

59. Cf. K. Galling in G. Beer, *Exodus. HAT* I/3 (1939), 133.

60. M. Löhr, *Das Räucheropfer im AT. Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft* 4/4 (1927), 182, understands this as a hanging lamp.

61. → כבה *kāḇâ* (VII, 38-39); see also *d'k.*

62. See *BHS.*

that the light in the tent of the wicked no longer shines, since the lamp above him has gone out (cf. Job 21:17, where the extinguishing of the lamp of the wicked is described as their calamity, *'êḏ*). In the pronouncement of punishment in Jer. 25:10 two metaphors describe how every sign of human habitation in the land will disappear: The early morning grinding of the millstones will no longer be heard, and in the evening no lamp will be seen burning.

Although the OT employs the lamp in various ways as a metaphor, the same is not true of the lampstand, though lamp and lampstand are correlated: "Like the shining lamp on the holy lampstand, so is a beautiful face on a stately figure" (Sir. 26:17). On the other hand, *Gen. Rab.* 20:7 compares the noble woman with a golden lampstand, and her base husband with a clay lamp: *mnwrh šl zhb wnr šl hrs 'l gbh,* "a golden lampstand and a clay lamp standing on it."

4. *David.* Assuming that *nîr* can represent a secondary form of *nēr,*[63] we find that several passages apply the metaphor of the lamp to David or to the Davidic dynasty.[64] In 2 S. 21:17 David's men implore him with the words: "Go out no more with us to battle, lest you quench the lamp of Israel." They fear that David could be killed in battle against the Philistines, so that the "lamp of Israel" (David as king) would be extinguished when it had hardly begun to burn. One should also view 1 K. 11:36; 15:4; 2 K. 8:19 and 2 Ch. 21:7 against the background of this verse. In 1 K. 11:36 the prophet Ahijah of Shiloh says to Jeroboam that though he (Jeroboam) will be king over Israel, a son of Solomon will continue to reside in Jerusalem so that the promises made to David will not be completely abrogated. Similarly, after negative estimations of the reigns of Abijam (1 K. 15:4) and Joram (2 K. 8:19 par. 2 Ch. 21:7), a Deuteronomistic redactor[65] points out that, in spite of this, for David's sake a lamp will remain before Yahweh; this metaphor expresses confidence that the Davidic dynasty will not perish, though it is not clear why this Deuteronomistic reference appears only in connection with Abijam and Joram.

Ps. 132:7 asserts that Yahweh will prepare a horn and a lamp for David. Here, too, the lamp can be understood as a symbol for the enduring dynasty (the horn might refer to the male *potestas* necessary for the continuation, or be viewed as a vessel for the oil necessary to refill the lamp), so that one need not interpret the lamp as a symbolic term deriving from the royal cult (with reference to Egyptian texts);[66] rather, this is a "promise of blessing, culminating in the blessing of David."[67]

5. *Yahweh.* The metaphor of divine favor is taken from image of the continually burning lamp; Job (29:3), reflecting nostalgically on his former happiness, mentions

---

63. Cf., however, I.1 and 2 above.

64. Cf. van der Kooij.

65. Cf. T. Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie. AnAcScFen* B 193 (Helsinki, 1975), 118f.

66. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1989), 483.

67. H. Gese, "Der Davidsbund und die Zionserwählung," *ZTK* 61 (1964) 16 = *Vom Sinai zum Zion* (Munich, 1974), 119.

that God "let his light shine" over his (Job's) head (*b^ehillô* is to be understood as *bahillô* in the sense of *bah^ahillô*). Thus it is Yahweh who makes a person's lamp bright (Ps. 18:29[28]), or who is himself a person's lamp, as we read in the parallel passage 2 S. 22:29. Since Yahweh's word and commandment show a person the right way, they are like the nocturnal light lighting the way (Ps. 119:105: "Thy word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path"; Prov. 6:23: "For the commandment is a lamp and the teaching a light"; Ps. 119:105 appears in what is perhaps an abbreviated form on a Roman clay lamp in the inscription *nlt,* Prov. 6:23 on a Jewish bronze lamp).[68]

The fourth vision of the prophet Zechariah (4:1-6aα,10b-14) speaks of the seven lamps on the lampstand,[69] each with seven lips (Zec. 4:2) so that seven-times-seven flames burn, and identifies these lamps in its interpretation of the vision (4:10) as Yahweh's eyes, which range over the whole earth.[70] In contrast, the account of the day of Yahweh in Zephaniah (1:12) tells how Yahweh will search through Jerusalem with lamps to find even those who sit hiding in dark corners, so that no one escapes judgment. Both the MT and the Vulg. read the pl. *bannērôṯ,* and W. Rudolph explains this by suggesting that "a single lamp burns out too soon";[71] this can hardly be the meaning here, since, e.g., a lamp on the lampstand in the temple, freshly filled with oil, burned throughout the night, and since it would have been simpler to keep a jar nearby with oil for refilling the lamp (cf. Mt. 25:3). Both the LXX and Syr. thus consider a single lamp in Yahweh's hand sufficient. The Targ. "perceives the image as inappropriate for the omniscient God, and thus attenuates it to 'I will appoint investigators who will search through Jerusalem.'"[72] Perhaps the plural here alludes to Zec. 4:2, so that the lamps are to be understood as Yahweh's eyes, from which nothing remains hidden.

According to the MT Prov. 20:27 is also speaking about Yahweh's lamp: "The *n^ešāmâ* of man is the lamp of Yahweh, searching all his innermost parts." It seems that *n^ešāmâ* is understood here in the sense of a person's conscience, so that the verse is saying that "one's conscience is a God-given faculty for understanding our motives."[73] H. W. Wolff, however, points out that the meaning "spirit" or especially "conscience" is nowhere attested for *n^ešāmâ.*[74] Hence it is not going too far to accept the generally preferred conjecture *nōṣēr* instead of *nēr* and to translate: "Yahweh 'guards, watches over' the breath of man, he searches all his innermost parts." The synonymous parallelism supports this textual emendation.[75]

---

68. Cf. J. B. Bauer, "Ps 119,105a als Lampeninschrift?" *ZAW* 74 (1962) 324.

69. Cf. K. Möhlenbrink, "Der Leuchter im fünften Nachtgesicht des Propheten Sacharja," *ZDPV* 52 (1929) 257-86; R. North, "Zechariah's Seven-Spout Lampstand," *Bibl* 51 (1970) 183-206.

70. Cf. also K. Seybold, *Bilder zum Tempelbau. SBS* 70 (1974), 82f.

71. *Micha, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 263.

72. Ibid.

73. Ringgren, *Spruche,* 81 n. 6.

74. *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1974), 59-60.

75. → נשמה *n^ešāmâ.*

III. LXX and Qumran. The LXX translates *nēr* almost exclusively with *lýchnos* (the exception being Prov. 13:9 with *phṓs;* 20:10 = LXX 20:9a and 24:20 *lamptḗr*). The LXX seems also to have found the metaphor of the lamp in Nu. 21:30. Finally, the LXX renders *nîr* in Prov. 21:4 with *lamptḗr,* and similarly apparently reads *nēr* from *wnrgn* in 16:28, translating with *lamptḗr;* neither does it acknowledge *nîr* in Hos. 10:12 as "fallow ground," but rather, as in Prov. 13:9, arrives at a completely different metaphor by its rendering with *phṓs* than the MT; this shows "that the LXX in any case prefers the lampstand-light topology."[76]

In Qumran neither *nērôṯ* nor *m^enôrâ* plays any special role. Only 11QT 9:12 and 22:1 mention lamps.

Kellermann†

76. Michaelis, 327 n. 17.

נָשָׂא *nāśā';* **מַשְׂאֵת** *maś'ēṯ;* **מַשֹּׂא** *maśśō';* **מַשָּׂאָה** *maśśā'â;* **נָשִׂיא** II *nāśî'* II; **שְׂאֵת** *ś^e'ēṯ;* **שִׂיא** *śî';* **מַשָּׂא** *maśśā'*

Contents: I. Fundamental Meaning. II. Cognates: 1. Ugaritic; 2. Aramaic; 3. Akkadian; 4. Phoenician; 5. Moabite. III. OT Usage: 1. General Considerations; 2. Bearing in the Sense of Suffering; 3. *nāśā' 'āwôn* and Synonyms; 4. Idioms. IV. 1. Qumran; 2. LXX.

I. Fundamental Meaning. The root *nś',* "to lift high, carry, take," is a common Semitic root referring to the physical movement of raising, lifting up, and carrying, along

nāśā'. P. R. Davies, "Ark or Ephod in 1 Sam XIV, 18?" *JTS* 26 (1975) 82-87; W. Eichrodt, "Sin and Forgiveness," *Theology of the OT. OTL,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1961-67), II, 380-495; M. I. Gruber, "The Many Faces of Hebrew נשא פנים 'lift up the face,'" *ZAW* 95 (1983) 252-60; R. Knierim, *Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde im AT* (Gütersloh, ²1967); L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215; B. Lindars, "'Rachel Weeping for Her Children' — Jeremiah 31:15-22," *JSOT* 12 (1979) 47-62; K. D. Sakenfeld, "The Problem of Divine Forgiveness in Numbers 14," *CBQ* 37 (1975) 317-30; G. Schwarz, "'Begünstige nicht . . .'? (Leviticus 19,15b)," *BZ* 19 (1975) 100; I. L. Seeligmann, "Zur Terminologie für das Gerichtsverfahren im Wortschatz des biblischen Hebräisch," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 251-78, esp. 270ff.; E. A. Speiser, "Census and Ritual Expiation in Mari and Israel," *Oriental and Biblical Studies* (Philadelphia, 1967), 171-86; J. J. Stamm, *Erlösen und Vergeben im AT* (Bern, 1940), esp. 67-70; F. Stolz, "נשא *nś'* to lift, bear," *TLOT,* II, 769-74; V. Taylor, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation* (London, ²1952); W. Zimmerli, "Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel," *ZAW* 66 (1954) 1-26, esp. 9-12.

with every conceivable association. This wide semantic scope is attested throughout Semitic literature. In addition to the verbal root, we also find substantives, which form idiomatic expressions in specific contexts. The main emphasis, both in the physical and in the emotional and spiritual sense, resides in the notion of carrying or bearing, be it punishment, shame, or something similar. In the OT this notion has been expanded to include the principle of forgiveness, and forgiveness is itself associated with the idea of lifting away or taking away guilt, sin, and punishment. Since the expression for forgiveness is frequently semantically the same as "bearing the burden of punishment," forgiveness is frequently understood as "to bear, carry away, settle, etc."

II. Cognates.

1. *Ugaritic.* The root *nš'* occurs over 60 times in Ugaritic.[1] The fundamental meaning "to carry a burden" manifests itself frequently. The sun god lays the dead Ba'al on 'Anat's shoulders so that she can carry his corpse into the netherworld;[2] but 'Anat also "lifts" her wings to fly.[3] Paghat lifts up her father (Danel) and places him on a donkey.[4] In the Šaḥar-Šalim text *nš'* refers to the "raising" of a bow to shoot a bird.[5] Precisely in this text, however, several difficult passages occur. In *KTU* 1.23, 54, 65 the translation of *ši 'db* depends on whether one understands *'db* as a verb or a noun. In the first case the translation "arise [raise yourself] and present the offering" is appropriate; in the second case it is a "presentation [a lifting up] of an offering" (cf. 1 Ch. 16:29). In the myth of the struggle between Ba'al and Yamm, two of Yamm's emissaries come to the divine assembly. At their entry the gods drop their heads to their knees as a gesture of fear and subjection. Ba'al answers: "Lift up, O gods, your heads from upon your knees, from upon your thrones of princeship" *(š'u ilm r'aštkm lẓr brktkm ln kḥṯ zblkm).*[6] L. 29 responds: "The gods lifted up their heads from upon their knees." Although the reference is to the lifting of heads, the context also implies boldness and independence on the one hand, and the reestablishment of honor on the other. The corresponding OT idiom is *nāśā' rō'š.*[7] Ugaritic also uses the term to refer to the lifting of one's head in the literal sense alone.[8] The root *nš'* also appears frequently (30 times) in the phrase *nš' g wṣyḥ,* "to lift up one's voice and cry" (cf. Heb. *nāśā' qôl* + verb).[9] In order to liberate Ba'al from the power of the god of the dead, 'Anat "lifts up her voice and cries."[10]

Ugaritic (with 12 occurrences) as well as other Semitic languages attests the expression *nš' 'n wph,* "to lift up one's eyes and behold."[11] The expression "to lift up one's

1. *WUS,* no. 1859; *UT,* no. 1709.
2. *KTU,* 1.6 I, 14; *ANET,* 139.
3. *KTU,* 1.10 II, 10f.; *ANET,* 142.
4. *KTU,* 1.19 II, 10; *ANET,* 153.
5. *KTU,* 1.23, 37.
6. *KTU,* 1.2 I, 27f.; *ANET,* 130.
7. Cf. III.4.b below.
8. *KTU,* 1.16 III, 12.
9. See III.4.e below.
10. *KTU,* 1.6 II, 11f.; cf. *KTU,* 1.19 II, 12f., 16; and 1.4 II, 21; *ANET,* 140; cf. also 133, 141.
11. See III.4.d below; cf. *KTU,* 1.19 I, 29, II, 27; 1.4 II, 12; 1.10 II, 13; *ANET,* 142.

hands" *(nš' yd)* occurs twice, clearly referring to worship and offering, and thus to a form of human behavior in addressing the gods.[12]

The passive N stem of *nš'* occurs in reference to "carrying a sick man into his bed."[13] In contrast, the Gt stem means "to be upright, to get up," a reference either to one's erect posture while sitting or to raising oneself up.[14] For the OT compare the similar meanings of the niphal and hithpael (Nu. 23:24; Ps. 7:7[Eng. v. 6]; 94:2; Prov. 30:32; Isa. 33:10).

2. *Aramaic.* The root *nś'* occurs in all periods of Aramaic literature, and in widely varying contexts. Old Aramaic witnesses are the inscriptions from Panammuwa, Zakir, and Sefire, where the expression *nś' yd* occurs twice with the meaning "to pray" and "to take a solemn oath."[15] The expression *nś' 'l śptym,* "to raise to the lips,"[16] expresses the articulation of a plan, in the present context the planning of murders against a liege lord or his descendant. The meaning in the other Old Aramaic witnesses evokes more the fundamental meaning "to take away" (property), "to lift up high."[17]

Documents in Official Aramaic attest *nś'* in a marriage contract from Elephantine,[18] in which in the enumeration of the bride's property we find the remark *kpn lmnś' mšḥ,* "spoons [vessels?] for carrying [storing?] salve/oil." According to the Arshama document an official's son receives permission "to take possession, to assume responsibility" for property originally given to his father.[19]

The root *nś'* occurs 9 times in the words of Ahiqar in its original meaning of lifting up various goods (sand, straw),[20] as well as in the haphel "to cause to be carried." It refers to lifting one's foot, to taking possession, and to the high estimation of wisdom.[21] In Biblical Aramaic *nś'* occurs in Dnl. 2:31-35, where the wind carries away the pieces of the demolished statue like chaff. The impv. *śē'* (Ezr. 5:15) demands of Sheshbazzar that he take the temple vessels and assume responsibility for them. Finally, in Ezk. 4:19 the hithpael participle is used as a substantive in its meaning "to rise up against someone," and is associated here with *m^erad̲,* "rebellion," and *'ěštaddûr,* "sedition."

3. *Akkadian.* In Akkadian *našû* means "to lift up, take up." Here the field of meaning is definitely expanded when the reference is both to "carrying away" and "transporting" objects on the one hand, and to "accepting" objects on the other. The semantic nuance of taking possession is touched on, as is the notion of giving over and carrying goods for the purpose of tax collection. The term *našû* also refers to brandishing weap-

---

12. *KTU,* 1.14 II, 22; IV, 4f.; *ANET,* 143f. Cf. II.2; III.4.a below.
13. *KTU,* 1.14 II, 46; *ANET,* 143.
14. See esp. *KTU,* 1.17 V, 6; similarly *KTU,* 1.19, I, 21. Cf. *KTU,* 1.40 16f.
15. For "pray" see *KAI,* 202A:11; for "take a solemn oath" see 214:29.
16. *KAI,* 224:14-16.
17. For the former see *KAI,* 222B:38f.; for the latter, 224:26.
18. *BMAP,* 7:19.
19. G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century* B.C. (Oxford, 1954), 2:4.
20. Ll. 111f.; see *ANET,* 427-30.
21. See, respectively, ll. 122f.; l. 121 (cf. Driver, *Aramaic Documents,* 2:4); l. 95.

ons and to putting on and wearing clothes. In the metaphorical sense it refers to the elevation of a person to a higher status.[22] In the Š stem *našû* means "to cause to be carried," in the N stem "to be raised, elevated," or intransitively "to get up."

The following idioms are constructed in connection with substantives: *īna našû,* "to raise the eye(s)": "to watch out, to peer at greedily or eagerly"; *pānī našû,* "to raise the face": "to desire, yearn for, worry"; *qātē našû,* "to raise the hands": "to pray, take an oath"; *libba našû,* "to raise the heart": "to wish, strive for"; *rēša našû,* "to raise the head": "to inspect, elevate, honor"; then also *arna našû,* "to suffer punishment"; *ḫīṭa našû,* "to bear punishment for a crime"; and *piḫāta našû,* "to bear responsibility."

4. *Phoenician.* The root occurs 5 times in Phoenician, 4 of those in the Eshmunazar inscription[23] and once in *RES,* 1215, 6. The sarcophagus inscription of Eshmunazar is concerned with preventing his desecration or "removal" (taking up, carrying away). In *RES,* 1215 the term refers to the citizens of Sidon, who have to "pay, deliver up," taxes that are due.

5. *Moabite.* The root *nś'* occurs twice in the Moabite Mesha inscription with the metaphorical meaning "to lead." Thus Mesha leads an army to Jahaz in order to take it, and leads shepherds (?) to tend small livestock (?).[24]

Freedman — Willoughby

III. OT Usage. 1. *General Considerations.*

a. With more than 650 occurrences without any noticeable significant distribution statistics (except Ezekiel, with 68 occurrences), *nāśā'* represents a very common OT word; hence the large number of synonyms and antonyms comes as no surprise. Individual semantic spheres, however, should be examined separately.

In the meaning "to lift up," *nāśā'* is more or less synonymous with *'āmas,* "to lift," *sāḇal,* "to carry," *nāṭal,* "to load," then also *ybl* hiphil, "to bring," and *lāqaḥ,* "to take." Antonyms include *šlk* hiphil, "to cast, throw."

The niphal in the meaning "to be elevated, lifted up," can also be expressed by *rûm* or *qûm,* "to be high, raise oneself, arise," or by *gāḇah,* "to be high, exalted"; antonyms include *šāpēl,* "be low, abased." The piel corresponds semantically approximately to *nṭl* piel, "to suspend, keep, maintain," and to *gdl* piel, "to make great, powerful."

The expression *nāśā' pānîm* is largely equivalent to *ḥānan,* "to be gracious," *rāṣâ,* "to be pleased," though also to *knh* piel, "to flatter," *nkr* piel, "to prefer," and *nbṭ* hiphil, "to regard, look upon in a friendly manner."

The expression *nāśā' qôl* corresponds largely to *qārā',* "to call," and to *ṣā'aq,* "to cry out."

The expression *nāśā' 'āwôn* in the sense of "to forgive" is synonymous with the

---

22. → נשׂיא *nāśî'.*
23. *KAI,* 14:5, 7, 10, 21; *ANET,* 662.
24. *KAI,* 181:20, 30; *ANET,* 320.

verbs → סלח *slḥ,* "to forgive," and → כפר *kipper,* "to atone," then also with → נקה *nqh* piel, "to declare innocent," → כסה *ksh* piel, "to cover," and metaphorically *'br* hiphil, "to let (sin, guilt) pass by."

b. Hebrew constructs the following nouns from the verb: → נשׂיא *nāśî',* "one lifted up or exalted, prince"; **nāśî'* II occurs only in the plural with the meaning "damp fog, mist" (Ps. 135:7; Prov. 25:14; Jer. 10:13; 51:16);[25] → משׂא *maśśā',* "burden," "raising (the voice)" = "pronouncement, utterance";[26] *maś'ēṯ,* "lifting up, tax, offering," in the expression *maś'aṯ he'ānān,* "cloud of smoke, smoke signal" (Jgs. 20:38,40).[27] Other forms include *maśśō',* "partiality," lit. "raising of the face" (2 Ch. 19:7);[28] *maśśā'â,* "lifting up" (Isa. 30:27); and the textually very uncertain *maś'ōṯ* (Ezk. 17:9), which some think represents an aramaism (infinitive).[29]

The word *śᵉ'ēṯ* occurs with two meanings: as "lifting up, nobility" (e.g., Job 41:17; Ps. 62:5[4]), and as "skin blotch," lit. "raised place" on the skin (Lev. 13:2,10,19,28,43; 14:56).[30] Finally, the term **śî',* "loftiness, pride" (Job 20:6), is unique, and its derivation from *nāśā'* is not undisputed.[31]

Among these nominal constructions, → משׂא *maśśā',* "prophetic pronouncement," is of particular theological significance.

Fabry

c. The fundamental meaning of *nāśā',* "to lift, raise," is found in Gen. 7:17: "and the waters increased, and bore up the ark, and it rose *(rûm)* high above the earth" (cf. Isa. 5:26; 11:12; and elsewhere in reference to a field standard;[32] Isa. 10:26, a rod; 2:4, a sword). With the same meaning the verb can function as a kind of auxiliary verb, approximately in the sense of "to lift up in order to carry or hold" (Gen. 21:18; Jgs. 9:48; 2 S. 2:32; 4:4; Am. 6:10). From this perspective the meaning "to carry" emerges (Gen. 37:25; 44:1; 45:23; 1 S. 10:3; Jer. 10:5), then also "to carry away" (1 S. 17:34; cf. Nu. 16:15).

A semantic extension is evident when *nāśā'* no longer refers simply to physical lifting, e.g., in the semantic nuances of "to take away" (cf. Jgs. 21:23; 1 K. 15:22; 18:12; Lam. 5:13; Mic. 2:2) and "to receive" (Dt. 33:3; 1 K. 5:23[9]; Ps. 24:5). When the concern is with tribute or gifts, *nāśā'* can mean both "to give, bring" (Jgs. 3:18; 2 S. 8:2,6; cf. also Ps. 96:8; Isa. 60:6) and "to receive" (1 Ch. 18:11).

Jer. 17:21,27 inculcates the prohibition against bearing any burden on the sabbath. "Bearing the yoke" is a metaphor for the burden of suffering in Lam. 3:27. Weapon

---

25. For a discussion of the terminology of meteorological phenomena cf. R. B. Y. Scott, "Meteorological Phenomena and Terminology in the OT," *ZAW* 64 (1952) 11-25, esp. 24f.
26. Cf. *HAL,* II, 639f.; *BLe,* 490b.
27. Lachish Letter 4:10; cf. *KAI,* 194:10.
28. On the form's construction see *BLe,* 493zη or eη; cf. III.3.g below.
29. So *BLe,* 441c; cf. also *HAL,* II, 640.
30. → צרעת *ṣāra'aṯ.*
31. Cf. C. Rabin, "Etymological Miscellanea," *Studies in the Bible. ScrHier* 8 (1961), 399, who suggests it is a cognate of Arab. *šā'a(y),* "to wish."
32. → נס *nēs* (IX, 437-42).

bearers *(nōśē' kēlîm)* are frequently mentioned (Jgs. 9:54; 1 S. 14:1,6f.,12-14,17; 16:21; 31:4-6; 2 S. 18:15).

Several passages speak of carrying the ark: in the wilderness (Ex. 37:5), crossing the Jordan (Josh. 3:3,8, etc.; 4:9f.), at the conquest of Jericho (Josh. 6:6,12,13), and while transporting the ark to Jerusalem (2 S. 6:3f.,13,15). The *miškān* and its furnishings are carried in the wilderness (Nu. 1:50; 10:17; utensils also in Ex. 37:14f.,27; cf. also Isa. 52:8). Deutero-Isaiah speaks scornfully about carrying idols (Isa. 45:20 and esp. 46:1,3,4,7, according to which the animals carrying the images become tired themselves, while God carries his people always; cf. also Am. 5:26).

The wind lifts up chaff and such and carries it away (Isa. 40:24; 41:16) — thus are human beings before Yahweh; 57:13 says something similar about useless idols; cf. also 64:5(6): "Our iniquities, like the wind, take us away." The Spirit of Yahweh seizes the prophet and carries him away (1 K. 18:12; 2 K. 2:16); this is said several times of Ezekiel (Ezk. 3:12,14; 11:1; 43:5).[33]

During the time of salvation Israel's mountains will become green and "bear" fruit *(nāśā' p^e rî*, Ezk. 36:8); metaphorically the assertion is made (Ps. 72:3) that under a good king the mountains and hills will bear *šālôm* and *ṣ^e ḏāqâ*. The vine of Israel brings forth *('āśâ)* branches and bears fruit *(p^e rî*, Ezk. 17:8; v. 23 exchanges the verbs).

Ringgren

The most frequent meaning of *nāśā'* niphal is "to be high, elevated, lifted up," then also "to be exalted." This is said of God (Isa. 6:1; 57:15; cf. Ps. 94:2; Isa. 33:10), of the Servant (Isa. 52:13), of the kingdom (1 Ch. 14:2), of hills and mountains (Isa. 2:2), etc.

The term *nāśā'* also refers to the "carrying" or "bearing" of burdens with the connotation of empathy and concern. This extends to the sharing and collective bearing of burdens. In this general category the verb refers to the bearing of responsibility. In Ex. 18 Jethro advises Moses to share the responsibility of leadership with appointed judges, "so it will be easier for you, and they will 'bear' [responsibility] with you" (v. 22; cf. Nu. 11:11-14; Dt. 1:9-12). Although the initial concern is with administrative responsibilities, the office of leadership also involves bearing the people's complaining and murmuring. At the same time, however, this task of carrying the people as a father carries his child (Nu. 11) implies that such leadership includes warm and loving concern for the people. Carrying a people means loving and protecting it, sharing its burdens, yet also exposing its mistakes (cf. also Dt. 14:24; Job 21:3).

The same expression can be applied to God's relationship with Israel: He carried Israel through the wilderness not only in the sense of guidance but also and especially in the sense of support. The metaphor in Ex. 19:4 shows "how I bore you on eagles' wings and brought you to myself" (cf. Dt. 32:11). Dt. 1:31 addresses God's parental

---

33. See G. Widengren, *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets. UUÅ* fasc. 10 (1948), 103ff.

concern for his people using *nāśā'*: "You have seen how Yahweh your God bore you, as a man bears his son, in all the way that you went." The notion of carrying exhibits emotional connotations here deriving from the father-son relationship.

Prophecy employs the metaphor in the same sense in its reference to the shepherd who carries his lambs (Isa. 40:11; 46:3; 63:9). In its fullest sense, then, "carrying" implies "helping, guiding, leading, supporting, and caring for."

Such "carrying" also includes "bearing." Moses bears the burden of people; he bears not only their accusations, but also their difficulties and weaknesses. Something similar is said of God, though he, too, can ultimately become too weary to bear the burden of the people (cf. Isa. 1:14; Jer. 44:22).

2. *Bearing in the Sense of Suffering.* "Bearing a burden" resembles semantically the notion of bearing in the sense of suffering. This is the meaning of *nāśā'*, e.g., in Job 34:31; Ps. 55:13(12); Prov. 18:14; 30:21. This is especially clear when the verb is associated with objects such as *ḥerpâ*, "scorn, abuse" (Ps. 69:8[7]; Jer. 15:15; 31:19; Ezk. 36:15; Mic. 6:16), *k^e^limmâ*, "disgrace" (Ezk. 16:52,54; 32:24f.,30; 34:29; 36:6f.; 44:13), and others.

In Jer. 10:19 the nation (?) confesses that it must bear an affliction, according to 31:19 the disgrace of its youth. These laments witness a reflection on one's guilt, the awareness of having been chastised by God, and the admission of shame prompted by one's own transgressions (cf. Ezk. 16:52,58; 32:24f.; 36:7, et passim).

The focal point is frequently the source of one's disgrace: Israel's enemies, neighboring nations. The outcome, however, is almost the same, since such pressure from adversaries is viewed in connection with Israel's own sins. The demise of the kingdom is the main object of scorn that Israel must bear (as a consequence of its own guilt and of external oppression). The ambivalent character of *nāśā'* is reflected here in the fact that it is used with equal facility to refer both to the raising of accusations against someone and to the bearing of scorn brought by others. The righteous person is thus said to bear the shame brought upon him by his adversaries, while he himself raises no charges of his own against his neighbors. Thus we read of suffering the reproaches of the nations (Ezk. 34:29; 36:6f.,15), though these same nations must then suffer their own humiliation (Ezk. 36:7; cf. Ps. 89:51[50]) as punishment for the humiliation they have themselves meted out. Bearing in the sense of suffering thus cannot in any way be limited to physical suffering alone. Indeed, more attention is given to offenses resulting from words, and to insults and the smearing of a person's honor in mockery and taunts.

One series of passages touches on the aspect of injustice to the point of theodicy. The speaker asseverates his own innocence, yet must suffer the most grievous persecution (Ps. 69:8[7]; Jer. 15:15). Here the notion predominates that it is possible to suffer disgrace for someone else's sake, especially for God; this does not yet, however, address the question of representative suffering, since these afflictions issue from adversaries, not from God. A person does not bear them in someone else's stead but rather out of faithfulness and loyalty to God. This notion is associated with the use of the expression *nāśā' 'āwôn* in the meaning "forgiveness of sins and recon-

ciliation,"[34] and its implications are obviously important for theology: there is suffering (the bearing of insult and reproach) that does not result from sin but rather from one's faithfulness and loyalty to God.

3. *nāśā' ʿāwôn and Synonyms.* The root *nāśā',* in connection with terms for sin and related words,[35] means lit. "to bear (injustice, sin, transgression)," an expression referring to three specific situations.

a. The first is the bearing of one's own iniquity in connection with the confession of one's own guilt and an understanding of its punishment. Taking guilt upon oneself in this sense means acquiring an understanding of the relevant context and its acceptance. The reference can be to ritual regulations: priests wear linen breeches "lest they bring guilt upon themselves" (Ex. 28:43; cf. Lev. 22:9; Nu. 18:32). According to Nu. 18:22 the Israelites are not permitted to approach the ark of the covenant, since in doing so they would profane the sacred place and bring guilt upon themselves. According to Lev. 19:17 one is not to hate one's brother lest one bring sin upon oneself. This seems to confirm the notion that by not putting aside concealed hatred against one's fellow a person brings guilt upon him- or herself for the sake of that other person. Responsibility for guilt involves both an ethical and a ritual basis, even if OT laws do not address this distinction explicitly. The ritual is worthless if performed without inner participation, particularly since it is supposed to express one's innermost disposition (humility, worship, righteousness, conversion, etc.).

Yet another matrix is addressed by the fact that Aaron is responsible for transgressions involving the holy offering (Ex. 28:38); this is a matter of ongoing responsibility, not of specific deeds. Even though the focus is on accoutrements, ethical concerns are implied here as well (cf. Nu. 18:1).

The expression *nāśā' ʿāwôn* also refers, of course, to responsibility for one's current transgressions. According to the ancient Israelite legal principle deriving from the act-consequence relationship, a sinner has to answer personally for his or her own transgressions. Only rarely do texts mention any influence by God on this situation.

"Bearing guilt" and "suffering punishment" are to be distinguished, though they are frequently viewed together. Specific transgressions are punished by specific measures, but the payment of such punishment does not remove guilt. The person who transgresses against the law incurs serious guilt, since through one's transgression one has alienated oneself from God and from the worshiping community. This self-removal from the worshiping community is the most drastic effect of sin and can be borne only by the guilty person her- or himself. Here forgiveness and reconciliation commence with an alleviation of the burden of guilt, the removal of the divisive barrier, and a bridging of the separation. The consequences of the misdeed in the natural and historical sphere, however, are unaffected by this. The OT literature consistently uses the for-

---

34. See 3 below.

35. → עון *ʿāwôn; ḥēṭ',* → חטא *ḥāṭā' (chāṭā')* (IV, 309-19). For related words → פשע *pešaʿ.*

mula "he [the guilty person] shall bear his iniquity," i.e., he is responsible for his deed. This is equally a legal formula and a religious principle.

Ritual transgressions (Lev. 7:18; 17:16; 19:8; 22:16) generate their own guilt, though apparently not as a result of the underlying motivation; cf. Lev. 5:17: "If any one sins, doing any of the things which Yahweh has commanded not to be done, though he does not know it, yet he is guilty and shall bear [the consequences of] his iniquity." This rule would apply more to the sphere of cultic law (laws normally not familiar to the Israelite layperson) than to fundamental ethical principles. At the same time, ignorance may also be a factor in such complex prescriptions as those addressing forbidden degrees of kinship in sexual matters (which should be viewed more as sociological than ethical prescriptions). In such cases the burden of guilt is more a formality, since the essence of guilt involves premeditated violation and malicious intention. If the deed was committed in good faith or ignorance, then the guilt existed independent of any later acceptance, and the main concern was, e.g., for the payment of reparation or restitution.

According to Lev. 5:1ff., contact with a corpse makes a person unclean, and thus guilty, even if this occurs unknowingly, and a person defiles the community if he does not cleanse himself. Lev. 20:17-20 deals with transgressions against sexual laws, which similarly are described in the terminology of the contamination of the holiness of the community. Lev. 24:15 addresses blasphemy: "Whoever curses his God shall bear the consequences of his sin." Here we should also mention the ordeal to which the wife must submit who has been accused of infidelity (Nu. 5:31).

According to Nu. 9:13, the person who refrains from keeping the Passover though not on a journey shall bear the consequences of this sin. Ezekiel makes frequent use of this formula in ethical contexts. Thus the Levites must bear the consequences of the sins they committed in their past (Ezk. 44:9-14). The people must themselves bear the consequences of their idolatry (16:58; 23:35,49; cf. 30:26).

After his murder of Abel, Cain says to Yahweh: "My guilt [punishment, so RSV] is greater than I can bear" (Gen. 4:13). It is not clear whether this represents genuine repentance, an attempt to better himself, together with the realization that the burden of guilt is indeed too great (punishment has not been inflicted). What Cain is actually unable to bear is alienation and separation from God. The reference might also, however, be to the realization that his crime transcends bearing (= forgiveness).

The notion of repentance also resonates in Hezekiah's letter to Sennacherib: "I have done wrong; withdraw from me; whatever you impose on me I will bear" (2 K. 18:14). An essential element of repentance is the willingness to bear the consequences of guilt, even if, as is the case here with political motivation, this involves tribute. A theological parallel is found in Mic. 7:9: "Because I have sinned against Yahweh, I will bear his indignation." Here the people recognize in their own behavior the reason for Yahweh's wrath, and declare their willingness to bear the consequences necessary for reconciliation. Thus repentance consists precisely in accepting, rather than fleeing, consequences.

b. In Nu. 30:16(15) *nāśā'* refers to the acceptance of the consequences of an oath of another person: If a husband does not annul an oath of his wife within a specific period,

it goes into effect, and he must accept the consequences. This provides the point of departure for the notion of *nāśā' 'āwôn* as the bearing of the guilt of others, though the notion is yet rudimentary here, since in this entire matter ethical responsibility attaches to the husband alone. This comes more clearly to expression in 14:33: "They [your children] shall suffer for your faithlessness *(wᵉnāśᵉ'û 'eṯ-zᵉnûṯēḵem)*, until the last of your dead bodies lies in the wilderness." God visits the iniquity of the fathers on the sons (Ex. 20:5; Dt. 5:9). This is a common theological insight that basically represents a continuation of the act-consequence relationship beyond generational boundaries (cf. Jer. 31:29f.; Ezk. 18:2ff.); among the people it was presented as an interpretation for the punishment of the exile. The comprehensive prophetic diatribe in Ezk. 18 challenges this view and comes to the conclusion: "The soul that sins shall die. The son shall not suffer for the iniquity of the father, nor the father suffer for the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon himself" (v. 20).

c. The OT does attest the bearing of the guilt of another person for the purpose of forgiveness. According to Gen. 50:17 Joseph is to forgive the transgression of his brothers. Even if behind the brothers' objectionable behavior God's own salvific plan ultimately becomes discernible (cf. v. 20) and the guilt thereby already addressed, forgiveness and reconciliation depend ultimately on Joseph's actions, since he was the one affected by the transgression. For his brothers, too, however, reconciliation becomes possible only through the realization of their own guilt and their willingness to accept Joseph's indignation and to bear its consequences. Thus in the final analysis the *nāśā' 'āwôn* resides on both sides: with the person actually committing *'āwôn*, and with the person who forgives *'āwôn* (cf. 1 S. 25:28).

Divine forgiveness is already involved in human forgiveness. This is shown by the way Moses represents God before Pharaoh (Ex. 10:17), and becomes especially clear in the juxtaposition of Samuel and Saul (1 S. 15:25). Saul did not observe the regulations of holy war and is thus held accountable by Samuel as God's representative. To Saul's request "now therefore, I pray, pardon my sin *(śā' nā' 'eṯ-ḥaṭṭā'ṯî)*, and return with me, that I may worship Yahweh," the prophet responds with rejection, thus announcing Yahweh's judgment of condemnation.

d. In three instances the OT speaks symbolically of the bearing of guilt. According to Ezk. 4:4ff. the prophet is to bear the punishment of Israel and Judah, though he is himself innocent. Nonetheless, this is not a case of representative suffering, since the essential element is yet lacking: one's own suffering in the place of the suffering of another, or the punishing of the innocent in the place of the guilty. The prophetic act indicated here has purely symbolic value and thus does not remove the guilt from Israel and Judah. The prophet as God's representative is to portray Israel's guilt and its consequences. At the same time, he represents both Israel and Judah in this role-playing. Because the prophet is not actually Israel, however, he cannot bear Israel's guilt. His action is a demonstration.

Lev. 10:17 reports that the sin offering is given to the priests as something highly sacred, "in order to take away the guilt from the congregation and to make atonement for them before Yahweh." The connection through the inf. const. *lāśēṯ* and *lᵉḵappēr* lends

an ambiguous sense to the subject: scapegoat or priest. K. Elliger remarks: "The most important thing is the theological justification in v. 17b. It is highly unlikely that this should be understood as a synergetic process, as if the atoning efficacy of the offering depended on being eaten by the priests."[36] The function of the sin offering, however, is clear: atonement as the reestablishment of harmonious fellowship between God and human beings.[37] Atonement becomes necessary because of sin (cf. 4:26; 5:6,10; 16:30,34). The complete account of the sin offering is in 9:15-24. With the goat offering the priest is to make atonement for the people (v. 7), thus reestablishing their cultic acceptability.

This kind of cultic ritual, however, releases the people neither from the necessity of acquiring insight into its own guilt nor from repentance. Here, too, the goat symbolizes that the people bear their guilt, and what happens to the goat symbolizes the people's own fate. Just as the fire consumes the goat offering (Lev. 9:24), so does Yahweh accept the sin offering. Thus, on the one hand, the goat has borne the sins of the people; on the other hand, in accepting the offering, God also has borne (= lifted up, suspended) the sins of the people, i.e., he has forgiven them.

This ritual of sin offering exhibits considerable proximity to that of the Day of Atonement. The ritual is rather complex and apparently contains archaic elements. According to Lev. 16 it is to be performed in the seventh month on the tenth day. Lots are drawn for two goats as a sin offering for Yahweh and for the desert demon Azazel. The first goat is sacrificed to make atonement for the sanctuary because of the uncleanness of the Israelites. The priest lays his hands on the head of the second goat and confesses all the sins of the Israelites. "After he has put them [the sins] upon the head of the goat, he shall send it away into the wilderness by the hand of a man who is in readiness, and the goat shall bear all their iniquities upon him to a solitary land" (vv. 21f.).

At first glance it seems that the functions of the two goats overlap insofar as both bear the sins of the people. While the one goat represents a sacrificial animal and thus a necessary prerequisite for reconciliation, however, there is no talk of forgiveness *(nāśā')* on God's part. God, too, must bear the sins. The second goat seems to take on this task and in this respect to represent God. Only now does the two-sided *nāśā' 'āwôn* come together in the rite, and reconciliation is effected. Since the priest confesses the sins of the people over the head of the goat, the scapegoat becomes the "bearer" of those sins in the literal sense as well; it lifts them up and carries them into the desert outside the relational possibilities between God and human beings.

e. When God bears the guilt of others, the reference is to divine forgiveness. Here the previous connotations flow together: "lifting up, carrying, bearing, bearing responsibility." God has much to bear from human beings (Isa. 63:9; Jer. 44:22). God is acknowledged as the "forgiver of sins" as early as in the confession of faith in Ex. 34:7; cf. Nu. 14:18 (cf. also Mic. 7:18; the parallel expression *'ōḇēr 'al peša'*, "who passes over transgression," is noteworthy here). All the injustice human beings inflict on one

36. *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 139.
37. → כפר *kipper* (VII, 288-303).

another also affects God, or vice versa: all sins against God find expression in transgressions against human beings. According to Mic. 7:18 (cf. Ps. 99:8; Hos. 1:6) God not only bears this injustice but also takes it on in a positive way. God's bearing of such injustice is always an act of forgiveness. This does not mean that he acts as if no transgression had occurred; rather, he refrains from requital. The result is that though God does not suspend the consequences for the sinner, neither does he prolong them. He forgives and does not reject. This is what is meant by God's → **חסד** *ḥesed*. God frees the sinner from the burden of his guilt, he lifts it up, suspends it *(nāśā' 'āwôn),* by taking on the injustice. This is understood literally when Mic. 7:19 speaks of God casting all the sins of human beings into the depths of the sea (cf. the scapegoat analogy).

In a reverse fashion, one can also say of God that he does not forgive (Josh. 24:19). There is ultimately no difference in this understanding of God from that in Mic. 7:18; rather, God's will to forgive founders on the refusal of human beings to recognize their guilt (cf. v. 20). According to Ex. 23:21 it is the angel of Yahweh[38] who will not bear *(nāśā')* human rebellion, i.e., will not forgive it. Again, human behavior is the determining factor.

According to Ex. 34:6f. (J), "Yahweh is a merciful and gracious God, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, keeping steadfast love for thousands, bearing [RSV 'forgiving'; *nāśā'*] iniquity and transgressions and sin, but who will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children" (cf. Nu. 14:18; Jon. 4:2). Here the contrasting pair *nōśē' 'āwôn* and *pōqēḏ 'āwôn* are used to correct simplified notions of the process of divine forgiveness and of the relationship between sin and righteousness, sinner and God. The profusion of adverbs is a summary of Israel's experience with its God in history.

After the making of the golden calf Moses petitions God to take away the sins of the people (Ex. 32:32), though he himself threatens to visit their sins upon them (v. 34, paronomastic *pāqaḏ*), a threat that according to the writer was realized by the death of the entire wilderness generation.

A similar situation obtains in Nu. 14 (JE). After the people's rebellion Moses petitions: "Pardon, I pray *(s^elaḥ),* the iniquity of this people, according to the greatness of your steadfast love, and according as you have forgiven this people *(ka'ašer nāśā'ṯâ lā'ām hazzeh),* from Egypt even until now" (v. 19). The use of *nāśā'* is explained by the phrase "according to the greatness of your steadfast love." This is not a matter of a particular instance of forgiveness, but rather of God's patience and forbearance. A different understanding of forgiveness manifests itself in the usage of *sālaḥ.* Here it is a matter only of not carrying out the threat made immediately beforehand (the extinguishing of the entire wilderness generation) in the sense of a postponement of the punishment.

According to Hos. 14:2-3(1-2), the prophet urges Israel to repent so that God might grant forgiveness *(nāśā' 'āwôn),* the point of departure for further reconciliation and for a flourishing existence (vv. 5ff.[4ff.]). Forgiveness is to be understood as the removal of guilt and of the barriers separating God and human beings. In Isa. 33:24 the

---

38. → **מלאך** *mal'āḵ* (VIII, 308-25).

rare (though cf. also Ps. 32:1) formulation in the passive occurs: *n^eśū' 'āwôn,* "the people who dwell in Zion will be forgiven their iniquity." The focal point here is probably the parallel view of forgiveness and the healing of sickness (v. 24a) as a sign of the messianic age. Cf. also Ps. 103:3 concerning the association of sin/sickness and forgiveness/healing *(sālaḥ/rāp̄ā').* For a critical view of the doctrine of the act-consequence relationship providing the background here cf. Job. 7:20f. (here *nāśā' peša'* par. *he^eḇîr 'āwôn*).

God's forgiveness is a frequent theme in the Psalms; such forgiveness manifests itself in the suspension of punishment and in the presence of divine grace evident in the changing of one's fate and in the repulsion of one's adversaries (Ps. 25:18; cf. vv. 7,11). Although it means blessing,[39] it does require human repentance (32:1f.,5); it also results in the restoration of exiled Israel (85:3[2]).

The expression *nāśā' 'āwôn* also occurs in the complex literary songs of the Suffering Servant.[40] Isa. 52:14 and 53:1-3 portray the Servant as a sick and disfigured person. His form attests the connection between sin and sickness according to OT thinking (cf. 53:4b); the physical suffering of the Servant appears as the consequence of sin. The astounding disclosure (introduced by *'ākēn,* v. 4; anticipated in 52:15–53:1), however, is that he does not suffer for his own sins but rather effects representative atonement. In view of the rite of the scapegoat (see above), one can attribute the following connotations to *nāśā'* in these texts: The Servant suffers as a result of our sickness (cf. v. 3), he bears its burden, carries it away, and heals us from it (cf. v. 5).

Verses 5ff. describe the Servant as the victim of false justice: "But he was wounded because of [or: in consequence of, *min*] our transgressions, bruised for [in consequence of] our iniquities." By taking this treatment upon himself, the Servant sets the process of forgiveness in motion. According to v. 6 Yahweh laid our guilt on him, i.e., Yahweh made it possible for him to be the "sacrifice" or "offering" for our sins, even though no sacrificial terminology is used here (including v. 7). The Servant's most important responsibility is to be the target of attacks and accusations. The turning point comes in v. 10: the triumph of the innocent Suffering Servant (on this language cf. 52:13; 53:12), attributed only to his representative suffering (vv. 11f.). Interpreters justifiably point out repeatedly that the Servant's being and actions exhibit divine features.

Freedman — Willoughby

Interpreters usually decline to offer a common translation for the two meanings of *nāśā' 'āwôn.* The fact remains that the meaning "to bear guilt, iniquity" occurs exclusively in P and Ezekiel (the possible exception being Gen. 4:13), while the meaning "to forgive" is found largely in the Deuteronomistic history (Hos. 1:6 and 14:3[2] are not clear). *HAL* associates the meaning "to bear guilt/iniquity" with Akk. *ḫīṭa našû,* "to bring transgression upon oneself" = to make oneself culpable, and *arna u ḫīṭa našû,* "to

39. → אשרי *'ašrê ('ashrê)* (I, 445-48).
40. → עבד *'āḇaḏ.*

bear [share the burden] of guilt and transgression."[41] The meaning "to forgive guilt" is explained from *nāśā'* in the sense of "taking away," the association being with the removal of guilt.[42]

Ringgren

4. *Idioms.* a. *nāśā' yāḏ.* The expression *nāśā' yāḏ,* "to raise the hand(s),"[43] refers to an act of hostility (2 S. 18:28; 20:21) and the use of power (Ps. 10:12; 106:26). It also refers to the gesture accompanying a solemn oath or a petition to Yahweh, which is why the expression can mean "to take an oath" (Ex. 6:8; Nu. 14:30; Dt. 32:40; Neh. 9:15; Ezk. 20:5,6,15,23,28,42; 36:7; 44:12; 47:14).[44] Interestingly, Yahweh is the subject in every instance. If this is said of a person, the expression *hēqîm yāḏ* is used (cf. Gen. 14:22). The lifting of the hands might be an affirmative gesture,[45] and less a symbolic threat of death in the case of a broken oath.[46] Concerning the meaning of *nāśā' yāḏ* in the sense of "to pray" cf. Ps. 28:2; Lam. 2:19.[47] Finally, *nāśā' yāḏ* par. → ברך *brk* can refer to a gesture of blessing (Lev. 9:22; Ps. 134:2; perhaps also Ps. 10:12).[48]

b. *nāśā' rō'š.* The expression *nāśā' rō'š,* "to lift up the head,"[49] denotes an act of audacity or independence and pride (cf. Jgs. 8:28; Job 10:15 [as an expression associated with acquittal, cf. the use with *pānîm* in 11:15]; Ps. 83:3[2] [cf. Ps. 110:7 with *hērîm*]; Zec. 2:4[1:21]). "Lifting up the head of another person" can be meant literally (cf. Gen. 40:19), though also metaphorically in the sense of a restoration of honor (Gen. 40:13,20; cf. 2 K. 25:27). Technical usage occurs in Ex. 30:12; Nu. 1:2,49; 4:2,22, where *nāśā' rō'š* means "to count, number," or "to conduct a census."[50]

c. *nāśā' pānîm.* The expression *nāśā' pānîm,* "to lift up one's face, countenance,"[51] can be meant literally (2 K. 9:32). Lifting up one's face is a sign of well-being and of good conscience (2 S. 2:22; Job 11:15; cf. esp. Gen. 4:7 and the contrasting construction *nāpal pānîm,* vv. 5,6). When God lifts up his face, he bestows grace and blessing (Nu. 6:26; cf. Ps. 4:7[6]). "Lifting up another person's face" implies a show of grace and favor. This reflects the ruler's show of favor toward a petitioner; cf. Yahweh's re-

---

41. *HAL,* II, 726. See E. Weidner, "Hof- und Haremserlasse assyrische Könige aus dem 2. Jahrtausend vor Chr.," *AfO* 17 (1956) 270; and concerning the OT witness W. Zimmerli, *ZAW* 66 (1954) 9-12 = *Gottes Offenbarung. GSAT* 1. *ThB* 19 (²1969), 160f.

42. See J. J. Stamm, *Erlösen und Vergeben im AT* (Bern, 1940), 66-70; Knierim, *Hauptbegriffe,* 50ff., 114-19, 193f., 218ff.

43. → יד *yāḏ,* V, 393-426, esp. 416, 424.

44. → V, 424.

45. Cf. G. Giesen, *Die Wurzel* שׁבע *"schwören": Eine semasiologische Studie zum Eid im AT. BBB* 56 (1981), 43.

46. A. D. Crown, "Aposiopesis in the OT and the Hebrew Conditional Oath," *Abr-Nahrain* 4 (1963/64 [1965]) 107f.

47. On the Mesopotamian "prayers of hand raising" *(šu'illa)* cf. *SAHG,* 19.

48. → V, 411.

49. → ראשׁ *rō'š.*

50. On the influence of Akkadian here, cf. F. X. Steinmetzer, "Zu den babylonischen Grenzsteinurkunden," *OLZ* 23 (1920) 153.

51. → פנים *pānîm.*

action to Abraham's request concerning Sodom (Gen. 19:21), David's gracious acceptance of Abigail (1 S. 25:35), and God's consideration toward Job (Job 42:8f.; cf. further Gen. 32:21[20]; Dt. 28:50; 2 K. 3:14; Lam. 4:16; Mal. 1:8f.).

In substantive form this expression occurs as *neśu' pānîm,* "he with his head lifted up," as a reference to prominent personalities (2 K. 5:1; cf. Job 22:8; Isa. 3:3; 9:14[15]). Since the meaning of the expression has something to do with a demonstration of special preference or a show of favor, it is positive-negative-ambivalent. The negative component predominates in juridical contexts, where *nāśā' pānîm* is identical with partiality and is associated with bribery and the perversion of justice (cf. Prov. 6:35). Although Yahweh intervenes for his own, he is characterized as one "who is not partial" (*lō'-yiśśā' pānîm,* par. *lō' yiqqaḥ šōḥad,* Dt. 10:17). In the same way, partiality toward the poor is also forbidden (cf. Lev. 19:15; cf. Ps. 82:2; cf. also Job 13:8,10; 34:19; Prov. 18:5).

d. *nāśā' 'ênayim.* The expression *nāśā' 'ênayim,* "to lift the eyes," is extremely widespread and refers to eager looking, particularly since it is normally followed by → ראה *rā'â,* "to see" (35 times). The notion of honor or veneration is also occasionally associated with it (cf. 2 K. 19:22; Ps. 121:1; 123:1; Isa. 51:6), or of cultic worship (Ezk. 18:6,12,15; 33:25) and idolatry.

e. *nāśā' qôl.* The expression *nāśā' qôl,* "to lift one's voice," is also quite widespread, and its meaning is obvious (cf. Ps. 93:3; Isa. 52:8). In its immediate context other verbs occur delimiting more specific semantic areas: → בכה *bāḵâ,* "to weep" (Gen. 21:16), → רנן *rānan,* "to shout with joy," and *ṣāhal,* "shout (for joy)" (Isa. 24:14), and → קרא *qārā',* "to speak out loud" (Jgs. 9:7). In the course of this expression's usage the subst. *qôl* can even be omitted entirely (cf. Isa. 3:7; 42:2,11) or be replaced by other nouns: → משל *māšāl* (Nu. 23:18: 24:3,15,20f.,23), → משׂא *maśśā'* (2 K. 9:25), → קינה *qînâ* (Jer. 7:29; Ezk. 26:17; 27:2; 28:12), and others (cf. Ps. 15:3; Jer. 9:9,17[10,18]).

It is possible that the oath formula *nāśā' šēm* in the Decalog (*lō' tiśśā' 'eṯ-šēm-YHWH laššāw',* "you shall not take the name of Yahweh in vain," Ex. 20:7; Dt. 5:11; cf. Ex. 23:1; Ps. 16:4) also belongs in this or a similar context.[52] The term *tepillâ,* "prayer," can also be the object of *nāśā'* (cf. 2 K. 19:4; Jer. 7:16; 11:14).

f. *nāśā' nepeš.* The expression *nāśā' nepeš*[53] seems to express a wish, interest, and a certain element of sympathy (Dt. 24:15; Prov. 19:18); a desire for sin (Hos. 4:8); mindfulness of deceit (Ps. 24:4);[54] though also trust in Yahweh (Ps. 25:1; 86:4; 143:8; cf. Lam. 3:41). The expression *nāśā' lēḇ*[55] is similar, and refers to encouragement (Ex. 35:21,26; 36:2), though also to arrogance and impetuosity (2 K. 14:10).

g. *Other Expressions.* The expression *nāśā' ḥēn* or *nāśā' ḥeseḏ* means "to find approval/favor" (Est. 2:9,15,17; 5:2), and belongs in approximately the same category as *nāśā' pānîm* (see above). The expression *nāśā' 'iššâ,* "to take a wife" (Ruth 1:4; 2 Ch. 11:21; 13:21; 24:3; Ezr. 10:44) stands (even without *'iššâ,* Ezr. 9:2,12; Neh. 13:25) for

52. → שׁם *šēm;* → שׁוא *šāw'.*
53. → נפשׁ *nepeš* (IX, 497-519).
54. Concerning the text see *BHS* and the comms.
55. → לב *lēḇ* (VII, 399-437).

"to marry." It represents an expression from the later period of the language, since older Hebrew uses *lāqaḥ 'iššâ* to refer to marrying.[56]

Freedman — Willoughby

IV. 1. *Qumran.* In Qumran *nāśā'* occurs about 60 times, with significant frequency in the various Community Rule writings: in 1QS (5 times), 1QSa (once), 1QSb (8 times), CD (7 times), then in 1QH (5 times), and 11QT (13 times), with wide semantic scope. Passages reflecting secular usage are rare: a tree brings forth (bears) leaves (1QH 10:25), the wind carries away grasses (4Q185 1:11); a person wears clothing (4QLam [4Q111] fr. 1, 2:11), carries away booty (11QT 58:12), though also consecrated offerings (11QT 43:14; 53:9). Anyone who lifts up the bones of the dead becomes unclean (11QT 51:4). On the sabbath a person may not even carry medicines or an infant (CD 11:9,11). In Qumran, too, the word *nāśā'* resembles *lāqaḥ*: to take a wife (11QT 57:15,18), to take possessions of the Gentiles (CD 12:7). No simpleton is allowed to hold office in the congregation (*lāśē't maśśā'* par. *hiṯyaṣṣēḇ*, 1QSa 1:20). No person may "carry on trade" (*nāśā' wᵉnāṯan*, CD 13:14) with outsiders.[57]

The expression *nāśā' pānîm* exhibits the same semantic scope and sphere of application as it does in the OT (1QS 2:4,9; 1QH 14:19; 1QSb 3:1,2,4), as does *nāśā' 'āwôn/ḥēṭ'*: Precisely in trafficking with outsiders the community member can bring guilt upon himself (1QS 5:14). A member should correct his companion lest he bring guilt upon himself (1QS 6:1; CD 9:8; cf. Lev. 19:17). Finally, desecration of the sanctuary leads to *nāśā' 'āwôn* (11QT 35:7; l. 14, *nāśā' ḥēṭ'*). According to CD 15:4, confession is the decisive step toward forgiveness granted by God (CD 3:18; 1QH 16:16[?]; cf. 4QDibHam[a] [4Q504] fr. 1-2, II, 7). 11QT 26:13 mentions the scapegoat ritual.

One interesting perspective emerges from 1QH 6:34. Though the textual problems attaching to this teacher's song (1QH 5:20–7:5) make caution advisable, the following statement can nonetheless be recognized: "Those who lie in the dust hoist a banner, and the worm of the dead, they raise up an ensign" (*šwkby 'pr hrymw trn wtwl't mtym nś'w ns*). The anthropological associations of the context do not allow any clear decision regarding whether this statement addresses the resurrection of the dead, especially since the related terminology derives from the conceptual sphere of the commencement of battle.[58]

2. *LXX.* The LXX has understood the more than 650 occurrences of *nāśā'* in an unusually extensive semantic range. The dominant renderings quantitatively for all stems are *aírein* and its compounds (about 230 times), *lambánein* and its compounds (about 200 times), *phérein* and its compounds (about 40 times), and *hypsoún ktl.* (about 15 times); the compound expression *nāśā' qôl* is rendered also by *boán ktl.*, *nāśā' 'ênayim* by *anablépein*, *nāśā' nep̄eš* by *mimnḗskesthai*, etc. The term *maśśā'* is in several instances rendered verbally by *aírein ktl.*, *apaiteín* or *thaumázein*, while the most fre-

56. → לקח *lāqaḥ* (VIII, 16-21).

57. → משא *maśśā'* (IX, 20-24).

58. Cf. H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde. SUNT* 15 (1980), 219-21.

quent nominal translations are *lēmma* (12 times), *bástagma* and *rhēma* (7 times each), *hórama, hórasis, phortíon,* and others.

The term *maśśā'â* is rendered by *lógion,* while the term *maś'ēṯ* caused some problems for the translators, since it receives completely different renderings. Finally, *maśśō'* is rendered by *dóxa; nāśî'* II by *nephélē; śᵉ'ēṯ* by *lēmma, oulḗ,* and others; while *śî'* is misunderstood as *tá dṓra* (Job 20:6).

Fabry

נָשַׂג *nāśag*

Contents: I. Etymology and Occurrences. II. Secular Usage. III. Religious Usage: 1. Cultic Contexts; 2. Other Contexts. IV. Sirach. V. Qumran. VI. LXX.

I. Etymology and Occurrences. Few equivalents to the root *nśg* are attested in other Semitic languages. They are found in Arab. *našağa,* "to hunt,"[1] and in Samaritan. Additionally, Aramaic witnesses are attested in an Aramaic inscription from the Neo-Assyrian period as well as in Ahiqar.[2]

The root *nśg* occurs 46 times in the OT, though only as a verb in the hiphil.

II. Secular Usage. The verb is used in secular contexts in Gen. 31:25; 44:4,6; Ex. 14:9; 15:9; Dt. 19:6; Josh. 2:5; 1 S. 14:26; 30:8; 2 S. 15:14; 2 K. 25:5; 1 Ch. 21:12; Jer. 39:5; 42:16; Lam. 1:3; Hos. 2:9(Eng. v. 7); 10:9. Except for 1 S. 14:26; 1 Ch. 21:12; Jer. 42:16; and Hos. 10:9, *nśg,* in the context of narratives (except Lam. 1:3), refers variously to overcoming spatial distance between two persons or groups of persons in the sense of "to catch up with, reach, attain." Here *nśg* is used several times in connection with *rdp* (Gen. 44:4; Ex. 15:9; Josh. 2:5; also Dt. 28:45; see below). In the other 4 passages mentioned this usage differs insofar as the concrete meaning is given up in favor of metaphor: in 1 S. 14:26 the participial expression is to be interpreted as "not to eat."[3] Within the framework of an oracle of judgment Jer. 42:16 speaks about the sword that in Egypt will overtake those who flee there; while Hos. 10:9, also in an oracle of judgment, speaks about the war that will come upon Israel. According to 1 Ch. 21:12 David is to choose, as punishment for having taken the census, whether among other things the sword of his enemies is to "overtake" him.

---

1. *HAL,* II, 727; cf. A. Guillaume, "Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography: A Comparative Study, II," *Abr-Nahrain* 2 (1960/61) 26.

2. A. Caquot, "Une inscription araméenne d'époque assyrienne," *Mélanges à A. Dupont-Sommer* (Paris, 1971), 9-16, esp. 9; Ahiqar 133, 200; trans. in *ANET,* 427-30; cf. J. M. Lindenberger, *The Aramaic Proverbs of Aḥiqar* (Baltimore, 1983), 128f.; *AP,* 217ff.

3. On the possible, but not essential, conjectures for *maśśîg,* cf. K. Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel. KHC* VIII (1902), 97; W. Caspari, *Die Samuelbücher. KAT* VII (1926), 165.

III. Religious Usage.

1. *Cultic Contexts.* In cultic contexts *nśg* occurs particularly in connection with sacrificial offerings. Thus Lev. 5:11; 14:21,22,30,31,32 variously provide for a "reduced sacrificial tariff"[4] when a person cannot come up with the prescribed offering: *('im-lō') taśśîg yāḏô.* Lev. 5 (and then probably also ch. 14) possibly reflects the impoverished circumstances of the postexilic cultic community.[5] Lev. 25:25ff. articulates regulations concerning the redemption of property in the Year of Jubilee. According to Lev. 25:26 the person who has no redeemer yet is able to acquire sufficient means *(wᵉhiśśîgâ yāḏô)* can redeem his property himself (similarly v. 49). Lev. 25:47 addresses the case of a stranger or sojourner who gains property or riches *(haśśîg yaḏ gēr)* and to whom an Israelite sells himself.

Lev. 27:8 provides for the possibility of redeeming a vow even if the person cannot come up with the sum actually required: the priest is to estimate how much the poor person can provide *(taśśîg yaḏ hannōḏēr).* Vows are also the concern in Nu. 6:21, which deals with regulations applying in the case of the Nazirite vow apart from "what else he can afford" *(taśśîg yāḏô).*[6] Finally, Ezk. 46:7 stands among those passages addressing the offering of the prince in the new temple: as a cereal offering accompanying the lambs the prince is to add as much as he is able *(ka'ᵃšer taśśîg yāḏô).*

2. *Other Contexts.* Gen. 47:9 occupies a position between secular and religious contexts. In conversation with Pharaoh, Jacob declares that his own years have not attained *(hiśśîgû)* to those of his fathers; he also qualifies negatively his life as years of foreign sojourning. In this sense *hiśśîgû* is to be understood here not only quantitatively but also qualitatively.

Both Lev. 26:5 and Dt. 28:2,15,45 stand in the context of blessing and curse. If the commandments are kept, Yahweh will bestow his special blessing on the land's fruitfulness. The time of threshing is to "reach" (*wᵉhiśśîg,* RSV "last") to the time of vintage, and the time of vintage to that of sowing *(yaśśîg).* Spatial usage is thus expanded into the temporal. Dt. 28:2 promises that if the divine commandments are followed, the blessings mentioned in vv. 3ff. will come on those who are obedient, while the threat in v. 15 promises similarly that the curses mentioned in what follows will come on the disobedient ones; v. 45 contains a similar pronouncement, construed with *hiśśîgûḵā,* whereby in comparison with v. 15 v. 45 has been expanded with *rdp.*[7]

Job 27:20 speaks of how floods will overtake the wicked like terrors *(taśśîgēhû).*

---

4. R. K. Harrison, *Leviticus. TOTC* (1980), 152.

5. So W. Kornfeld, *Levitikus. NEB* (²1986), 25.

6. On the translation problems attaching to the portions of the verse immediately preceding this formula, see B. Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri. HKAT* I/2 (1903), 482.

7. On the question of the identity of the author of these three conditional sentences as well as the question of their context, cf. the differing positions of J. G. Plöger, *Literarkritische, formgeschichtliche und stilkritische Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium. BBB* 26 (1966), 137f.; and G. Seitz, *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Deuteronomium. BWANT* 93 (1971), 263, 266.

Despite *laylâ* in v. 20b, the context does not necessitate emending *kammayim* here to *k*ᵉ*mô yôm.*[8] Job 41:18(26) presents translation problems. The formulation *maśśîgēhû ḥereb̲* first suggests a conditional sentence as a *casus pendens.*[9] Both K. Budde and B. Duhm argue against this conditional sentence and suggest an altered formulation.[10] The problems attaching to such alteration can be seen especially in Budde's discussion; he presents several alternatives that he considers possible, all of which involve considerable consonantal alteration. Since maintaining the formulation still yields a completely comprehensible text, however, no emendation is needed.[11] Thus the divine discourse draws attention to the immense power and might of Leviathan, who is unaffected even if one "reaches" or "strikes" him with a sword.

The verb *nśg* occurs in Ps. 7:6(5); 18:38(37); 40:13(12); 69:25(24); except for 40:13, all these psalms focus on enemies. In a lament (7:4-6[3-5]) a petitioner utters the "oath of the innocent";[12] in v. 6 he adjures that his enemy seize/overtake *(yaśśēg)* him if he be guilty of any transgression. According to 18:38(37) the petitioner claims that with God's help he pursues, overtakes *('aśśîg̲ēm),* and destroys his enemies. Ps. 69:25(24) is also directed against one's enemies. Within the framework of a lament the plea is directed to God that his anger might overtake the petitioner's enemies *('app*ᵉ*k̲ā yaśśîg̲ēm),* a plea whose content is then specified more closely by a precise description of just how the petitioner conceives Yahweh's actions against those enemies. Ps. 40:13(12) speaks in a similarly metaphorical fashion. In a petition appended to a thanksgiving psalm, the psalmist speaks of how his own iniquities have overtaken him *(hiśśîg̲ûnî ʿawônōt̲ay).* The preceding line of the verse makes clear that this expression might very well be based on concrete experience, since numerous evils have encompassed the petitioner. From the perspective of the act-consequence relationship, one can say here that the petitioner's sins have "overtaken" him in the form of those resultant sufferings.

The warning against the strange woman in Prov. 2:16-19 points out (v. 19) that those who go in to her[13] will no longer regain the paths of life *(lô' yaśśîg̲û 'orḥôt̲ ḥayyîm).*

Both Isa. 35:10 and 51:11 speak with identical wording about, among other things, how joy and gladness will seize *(yaśśîg̲û)* the redeemed of Yahweh. The LXX translation has prompted O. Procksch to the following consideration: "One can translate the concluding line according to either MT or LXX. In the first instance, the Israelites will attain joy and gladness, while sorrow and sighing will flee away. In the second, שָׂשׂוֹן וְשִׂמְחָה is the personified subject (cf. Ps. 23:6; 85:11), Israel the object, so that ישׂיגום

---

8. So M. H. Pope, *Job. AB* 15 (³1973), 194; cf. also M. Dahood, *Psalms 51–100. AB* 17 (1968), 163.

9. Cf. *GK,* §116w; R. Gordis, "Note on General Conditional Sentences in Hebrew," *JBL* 49 (1930) 200-203; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 527.

10. Budde, *Das Buch Hiob. HKAT* II/1 (²1913), 266; Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob. KHC* XVI (1897), 200.

11. Cf. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 526f.

12. So H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 170.

13. → בוא *bô'* (II, 20-49).

(LXX *katalémpsetai autoús*) should be read."[14] This alteration of the verb, however, is by no means necessary, since in the present Hebrew text both *śimḥâ* and *śāśôn* take over the function of a subject in the inverted verbal clause. The question remains how Isa. 35:10 and 51:11 came to have the identical text, though a clear decision regarding just which of the two verses is the original one is not completely possible.[15] This does not present problems for the interpretation of the verb *nśg*, however, since in this case it does not depend on the dating of the two verses.

The lament in Isa. 59:9 speaks of how justice is far off and righteousness does not reach us *(lō' taśśîgēnû ṣᵉḏāqâ)*. Once again the verb is used figuratively. Zec. 1:6 is similar; within the Yahweh discourse the congregation is asked: "But my words and my statutes . . . did they not overtake your fathers *(hiśśîgû)?*" That is, the fathers were not able to escape those words; rather, they were confronted by them.

IV. Sirach. The verb (again only in the hiphil) occurs 11 times in Hebrew Sirach (3:8; 6:4,12,16,18; 7:1; 12:5,12; 31[34]:22; 35:12). The only cultic context involving *nśg* is 35:12, according to which God accepts no bribes in connection with offerings. According to 7:1 and 12:5 evil will befall the person who himself does evil. Similarly, the "joy of hate" will overtake a person, i.e., will yield negative consequences (6:4). 6:12 points out that the false friend will turn away when evil "befalls" a person. In 6:18 *nśg* is connected with "acquiring wisdom." The person who fears God, however, will according to 6:16 acquire a faithful friend as a pledge of life. 3:8 issues the exhortation to honor one's father so that "all blessings may come upon you" (cf. Dt. 28). Sir. 12:12 is preceded by admonitions concerning one's dealings with enemies, suggestions concerning the things one should not undertake with them, "and later my words may reach you, and you would lament with my lament." The idea here is apparently that the admonition might reach a person too late. Sir. 31/34:22 also stands in the context of admonitions: "Listen to me, my son, and do not disregard me, and in the end my words will reach you." Here *nśg* is to be understood in the sense of "to be confirmed" (cf. the addendum at the end of the verse).

V. Qumran. The verb occurs 6 times in the Qumran texts, again only in the hiphil: 1QS 6:14; 7:8; 1QH 5:29; 17:9; CD 6:10; 1Q22 1:10. According to 1QS 6:14 the person who takes on or accepts discipline *(yaśśîg)* can be admitted into the community. Those who do not follow the instructions of the law, however, will not attain (instruction) *(yaśśîgû)* until the appearance of the teacher of righteousness (CD 6:10).[16] Dt. 28 is evoked by 1Q22 1:10 with its pronouncement that curses will come upon Israel *(wᵉhiśśîgûm)* if it does not keep the law. 1QH 5:29 recalls the Psalms, lamenting that the adversaries "have overtaken me in a narrow pass without escape" (cf. Lam. 1:3).

---

14. *Jesaia 1–39. KAT* IX/1 (1913), 438.

15. Cf. the differing conclusions arising as early as Procksch, *Jesaia,* 438; and K. Marti, *Das Buch Jesaia. KHC* X (1900), 248.

16. Concerning the diverse possibilities of dealing with this verse, see J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer,* 2 vols. (Munich, 1960), II, annotations on p. 50.

The sense of 1QH 17:9, to the extent that the text can be reconstructed at all, speaks about how depraved things have not reached them *(lō' taśśîgûm),* though it is not clear just who is meant by "they." 1QS 7:8 picks up the formula from Lev. 5:11, though not in a cultic context: Anyone who has caused a loss is to restore it. If he is unable to provide it *('im lō' taśśîg yāḏô),* he is punished with sixty days (of exclusion).

Despite its proximity to Deuteronomy, the Temple Scroll does not attest any occurrences of *nśg.*

VI. LXX. The multiplicity of possibilities for the usage of the Hebrew verb *nśg* is reflected in the Greek translation. No fewer than 16 different verbs are used, the most frequent being *katalambánein* (27 occurrences). No particular thematic tendencies are discernible in the choice of Greek equivalents except in the use of the verb *heurískein,* which is usually found in the translation of the formula *taśśîg yāḏô.*

Hausmann

נָשִׂיא *nāśî'*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences and Usage; 3. LXX. II. Witnesses: 1. Ancient Near East; 2. OT. III. Qumran.

---

nāśî'. J. Boehmer, "מלך und נשיא bei Ezechiel," *TSK* 73 (1900) 112-17; O. Calderini, "Il *nāśî'* biblico nell' epoca patriarcale e arcaica," *BeO* 20 (1978) 65-74; idem, "Evoluzione della funzione del *nāśî'*: il libro dei Numeri," *BeO* 20 (1978) 123-33; idem, "Considerazioni sul *nāśî'* ebraico, il *naši biltim* babilonese e il *nāšû* assiro," *BeO* 21 (1979) 273-81; idem, "Note su Es. 22,27," *BeO* 22 (1980) 111-18; A. Caquot, "Le messianisme d'Ezéchiel," *Sem* 14 (1964) 5-23; H. Cazelles, *Études sur le Code de l'Alliance* (Paris, 1946); idem, "Institutions et terminologie en Deut. 1,6-17," *Congress Volume, Geneva 1965. SVT* 15 (1966), 97-112; J. H. Ebach, "Kritik und Utopie" (diss., Hamburg, 1972); J. Flanagan, "Chiefs in Israel," *JSOT* 20 (1981) 47-73; H. Gese, *Der Verfassungsentwurf des Ezechiel. BHT* 25 (1957); M. H. Gottstein, "נשיא אלהים (Gen XXIII 6)," *VT* 3 (1953) 298f.; E. Hammershaimb, "Ezechiel's View of the Monarchy," *Studia Orientalia. FS J. Pedersen* (Hauniae, 1953), 130-40; M. Haran, "The Law-Code of Ezekiel XL–XLVIII and Its Relation to the Priestly School," *HUCA* 50 (1979) 45-71; S. Japhet, "Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 66-98; W. R. Irwin, "Qrî'ê ha-ʿedhah," *AJSL* 57 (1940) 95-97; idem, "Le sanctuaire central israélite avant l'établissement de la monarchie," *RB* 72 (1965) 161-84; D. Kellermann, *Die Priesterschrift von Num 1,1 bis 10,10. BZAW* 120 (1970); B. Lang, *Kein Aufstand in Jerusalem. SBB* 7 (1978); J. D. Levenson, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48. HSM* 10 (1975), 57-107; J. Liver, "נָשִׂיא," *EMiqr* 5 (1968), 978-83; G. C. Macholz, "Noch einmal: Planungen für den Wiederaufbau nach der Katastrophe von 587," *VT* 19 (1969) 322-52; A. D. H. Mayes, "Israel in the Pre-Monarchy Period," *VT* 23 (1973) 151-70; J. M. Milgrom, "Priestly Terminology and the Political and Social Structure of Pre-Monarchic Israel," *JQR* 68 (1977/78) 65-81; M. Noth, *Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels. BWANT* 4 (1930; repr. 1966); J. van der Ploeg, "Les chefs du peuple d'Israël et leurs titres," *RB* 57 (1950) 40-61; O. Procksch, "Fürst und Priester bei Hesekiel," *ZAW* 58 (1940/41) 99-133;

I. 1. *Etymology.* With the *qāṭîl* construction the substantival form *nāśî'* represents a *nomen professionis* deriving from the Proto-Semitic verb *nāśā',* with the fundamental meaning "to lift up" or "to elevate, raise, exalt," so that it is to be understood as "one raised up, exalted."[1] Additional occurrences of this nominal construction are found in the East Semitic and West Semitic linguistic spheres.[2] Attempts to derive the substantive from expressions such as *nś' pānîm*[3] or *nś'* qal are not persuasive.

Occurrences of the intransitive verb *nāśā'* qal in the sense of "to be exalted, high, elevated" are disputed (Hos. 13:1; Ex. 18:22).[4] In comparison, Nu. 11:17 exhibits the semantic equivalence to intransitive *nāśā'* in its expression *nāśā' bᵉmaśśā',* which can also be transferred to Ex. 18:22. Nah. 1:5 involves an ellipse with *qôl.*[5] In Hab. 1:3 either the perfect or participle niphal should be read,[6] while the imperative niphal should be read in Ps. 24:9.[7]

In addition, a substantive occurring only in the plural is also attested, *nāśî'* II, with the meaning "rising mist, vapor, cloud" (Ps. 135:7; Prov. 25:14; Jer. 10:13; 51:16).

2. *Occurrences and Usage.* The subst. *nāśî'* (one raised up, exalted) occurs 126 times in the OT, with most of those occurrences in the Pentateuch (4 times each in Genesis and Exodus; once in Leviticus; 60 in Numbers). It occurs 14 times in the Deuteronomistic history (12 times in Joshua; twice in Kings), 7 times in the Chronicler's history, and 36 times in Ezekiel.

L. Rost, *Die Vorstufen von Kirche und Synagoge im AT. BWANT* 24 (1938); J. M. Salmon, "Judicial Authority in Early Israel: An Historical Investigation of OT Institutions" (diss., Princeton, 1968); C. Schäfer-Lichtenberger, *Stadt und Eidgenossenschaft im AT. BZAW* 156 (1983), esp. 355-67; K. Seybold, *Das davidische Königtum im Zeugnis der Propheten. FRLANT* 107 (1972), 145-56; E. A. Speiser, "Background and Function of the Biblical Nāśī'," *CBQ* 25 (1963) 111-17; F. Stolz, "נשׂא *nś'* to lift, bear," *TLOT,* II, 769-74; J. Strugnell, "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumrân — 4QSerek Šîrôt 'Olat Haššabbāt," *Congress Volume, Oxford 1959. SVT* 7 (1960), 318-45; R. de Vaux, "La thèse de 'l'amphictyonie Israélite,'" *HTR* 64 (1971) 415-36; E. Vogt, *Untersuchungen zum Buch Ezechiel. AnBibl* 95 (1981); K. Weiss, "Messianismus in Qumran und im NT," *Qumrānprobleme,* ed. H. Bardtke (Berlin, 1963), 353-68; S. Zeitlin, "The Titles High Priest and the Nasi of the Sanhedrin," *JQR* 48 (1957/58) 1-5; W. Zimmerli, "Plans for Rebuilding After the Catastrophe of 587," *I Am Yahweh* (Eng. trans. 1982), 111-33.

1. See *GK,* §84l; Calderini, *BeO* 21 (1979) 273; Stolz, 773; van der Ploeg, 50; Calderini, *BeO* 20 (1978) 65; de Vaux, 431f.

2. For East Semitic see *AHw,* II, 762; *CAD,* XI/2, 79f. For West Semitic see *WUS,* no. 1860; *DNSI,* II, 763f.; J. Hoftijzer, G. van der Kooij, and H. J. Franken, *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Alla. DMOA* 19 (1976), 214.

3. Cazelles, *Études,* 81; Noth, 162.

4. Noth, 162.

5. See, respectively, H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans., 1974), 219f.; Cazelles, *Études,* 81.

6. Adduced by L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 186f.; cf. also W. Rudolph, *Micha, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 151.

7. See Rudolph, *KAT* XIII/3, 200; H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 311.

The assertion that the MT originally attested *n^e^śî'îm* instead of the present *'^a^nāšîm* in Josh. 4:2 and 9:14 is not supported by LXX *árchontes* in Josh. 9:14.[8]

Word combinations include *n^e^śî' '^e^lōhîm* (Gen. 23:6) and *n^e^śî' hā'āreṣ* (Gen. 34:2; Ezk. 39:18). In connection with names of countries the title occurs together with Israel (Nu. 1:44; 4:46; 7:2,84; Ezk. 19:1; 21:17,30[12,25]; 22:6; 45:9,16), Kedar (Ezk. 27:21), Judah (Ezr. 1:8), and Midian (Josh. 13:21), as well as with *yām* (Ezk. 26:16) as a geographical term. The term *nāśî'* occurs most frequently with terms referring to community social life. Thus there are the *n^e^śî'îm* of the individual tribes (Nu. 2:3-29; 7:10-83), of the families (Nu. 3:24,30,35; 17:17[2]), as well as the *n^e^śî'ê maṭṭôṯ '^a^ḇôṯām* (Nu. 1:16; 7:2; cf. 34:18,22-28), representing a combination of the first variations mentioned. In addition, the title is applied to the congregation (*'ēḏâ,* Ex. 16:22; 34:31; Nu. 4:34; 16:2; 31:13; 32:2; Josh. 9:15,18; 22:30).

The expressions *n^e^śî' n^e^śî'îm* (Nu. 3:32) and *n^e^śî' rô'š* (Ezk. 38:2f.; 39:1) are used to express the superior position of one *nāśî'* over other *n^e^śî'îm.*

Terms parallel to *nāśî'* include *kōhēn* (Nu. 27:2; 31:13; 32:2; 34:17f.; Josh. 17:4; 22:13f.,30,32), *rō'š* (Nu. 7:2; 13:2f.; Josh. 22:14,30; 1 Ch. 7:40; 1 K. 8:1), as well as *zāqēn* (1 K. 8:1; 2 Ch. 5:2) and *meleḵ* (Ezk. 32:29).

3. *LXX.* In most instances the LXX renders *nāśî'* with *árchōn,* and, second in order of frequency, with *aphēgeísthai.* Other translations include *basileús* (Gen. 26:3), *éthnos* (Gen. 17:20), *hēgoúmenos* (Josh. 13:21; 1 Ch. 7:40; 2 Ch. 5:2; Ezk. 44:3; 45:7), *anḗr* (Nu. 32:2), *archēgós* (Nu. 13:2; 16:2), and *antitassómenos* (1 K. 11:34). The LXX omits the occurrence in 1 K. 8:1. In two passages the LXX reflects *nāśî'* where the MT does not have it: Hos. 1:6 *(antitassómenos)* and Josh. 9:14 *(árchōn);* in Ezk. 28:12; 37:22,24; 43:7,9 it has kept *nāśî'* in mind in its rendering of *meleḵ* with *árchōn* or *hēgoúmenos.*

II. Witnesses.

1. *Ancient Near East.* The title *naši biltim* occurs in CH §§36-38,41, *biltum* referring here to a tax or tribute,[9] and *našum* to the person bearing this payment.[10] The *naši biltim* is a vassal who has leased lands belonging to the crown.[11] This understanding also emerges for an additional occurrence in a letter from Hammurabi to Shamash-Ḫazir.[12]

Several personal names constructed with *nśy* are attested in Mari, such as *ṣidqu*

8. Contra J. Dus, "Die Analyse zweier Ladeerzählungen des Josuabuches," *ZAW* 72 (1960) 124f. Cf. J. Soggin, *Joshua. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1972), 109.

9. *AHw,* I, 126; *CAD,* II, 232-36.

10. *AHw,* II, 765; Calderini, *BeO* 21 (1979) 278.

11. Cf. G. R. Driver and J. C. Miles, *The Babylonian Laws,* 2 vols. (Oxford, ²1956), I, 116: "rent-payer."

12. Cf. F. Thureau-Dangin, *RA* 21 (1924) no. 35, 10: "tenant, lessee"; and F. R. Kraus, *Briefe aus dem Archiv des Šamaš-Ḫāzir* (Leiden, 1968), no. 35: "state tenant, leaseholder."

lânasî, nawâr-kanasi, or *iaḫ-wi-nasi.*[13] The title *našu* occurs in Assyrian legal texts from the 11th century with the meaning "herald."[14]

Whereas in these East Semitic occurrences one can yet discern the active meaning of *našû* as "to carry, bear," the Northwest Semitic subst. *nāśî'* does not allow us to distinguish whether it is to be understood as an active or passive form.[15]

2. *OT.* a. *Preexilic.* The oldest biblical witness is found in the Covenant Code (Ex. 22:27[28]): "You shall not revile God, nor curse a *nāśî'* of your people."[16] The reasoning behind this prohibition derives from the authority of the *nāśî',* which is viewed in much the same way as that of God (parallelism!). Special attention should be given the formulation *b^e'amm^ekā,* which means that the prohibition refers only to an Israelite *nāśî'.*[17] The focal point is thus ultimately respect before legislative authority, in which case this can be compared with the Decalog (Ex. 20:12), since here the fear of God is followed by respect for parents.[18] According to H. Cazelles the danger of cursing comes from a man who has lost a judgment before *'^elōhîm* and his *nāśî'.*[19] In this instance *'^elōhîm* is not to be understood in its erstwhile presumed meaning as "judge," but rather as "God."[20] In comparison with Ex. 22:27(28), the accusation leveled at Naboth in 1 K. 21:10 *(bēraḵtā '^elōhîm wammeleḵ)* shows that in the preexilic period the title *nāśî'* had already fallen from use. Josh. 13:21 mentions the five *n^eśî'ê miḏyān* in connection with an area outside Israel, referring to vassals of the Ammonite king. In Nu. 31:8 the same persons bear the title *meleḵ.*

Like Josh. 13:21, 1 K. 11:34 distinguishes between *meleḵ* and *nāśî',* since although the kingdom is to be taken from Solomon, he will retain the status of *nāśî'.*[21]

b. *In P and Ezekiel.* Both P and Ezekiel come from the priestly tradition, and both refer back to the term *nāśî',* with P preceding Ezekiel.[22]

The relationship between the two textual complexes is such that the *nāśî'* as a leadership figure within the tribal system served as a literary model for the *nāśî'* in Ezk. 40–48. This is also supported by the fact that the *nāśî'* is associated with the *'am hā'āreṣ* (45:16,22; 46:2-3,8-9) in order to eliminate the social stratification of the preexilic period. Scholarship has not yet unequivocally resolved the question of the relationship between P and Ezekiel in regard to the *nāśî'.* M. Noth asserted the priority of the P conception in connection with the amphictyony hypothesis, against which especially L. Rost objected.[23] The assertion that the substitution of *nāśî'* for *meleḵ* is actu-

---

13. For the first see *APNM,* 98f.; for the last, *ARM,* VIII, 88, 6; VII, 200, 8, r. 10.
14. Cf. Calderini, *BeO* 21 (1979) 279f.
15. On the active see *NSS,* 184; on the passive see van der Ploeg, 50.
16. → קלל *qālal;* → ארר *'rr* (I, 405-18).
17. Rost, 71.
18. Cf. Calderini, *BeO* 20 (1978) 70f.
19. *Études,* 82.
20. Cf. Calderini, *BeO* 22 (1980) 114, on the Targs.; also Levenson, 62.
21. Concerning the text of the LXX cf. M. Noth, *Könige 1–16. BK* IX/1 ([2]1983), 243; on the question of textual redaction cf. Ebach, 51.
22. Cf. Haran, 57 n. 24 and 59-71.
23. Noth, *System,* 156-58; Rost, 74f.; cf. also Ebach, 56f. n. 41.

ally a result of Ezekiel's own initiative is controverted by the fact that even before Ezekiel, in Ex. 22:27(28)/1 K. 21:10 and Josh. 13:21/Nu. 31:8, the titles *nāśî'* and *melek̲* are already being exchanged.[24]

In Ex. 16:22 the *n*ᵉ*śî'îm* are the representatives of the congregation and function as their spokespersons before Moses. Ex. 34:31 also presupposes this, and in Ex. 35:27 the *n*ᵉ*śî'îm* constitute the only rank within the congregation.

For the mustering of warriors one man from every tribe is to be at the disposal of Moses and Aaron; this person is to be the head of a family (Nu. 1:4). After the enumeration of these men (1:5-15), 1:16 refers to them as "ones chosen from the congregation,"[25] "the *n*ᵉ*śî'îm* of their ancestral tribes, the heads of the thousands of Israel." This designation of the *n*ᵉ*śî'îm* as the heads of the thousands identifies them as military leaders, providing the background for the *nāśî'* understanding in Nu. 2. This identification of various functions in the figure of the *nāśî'* can also be discerned in 7:2, where the *n*ᵉ*śî'ê yiśrā'ēl* are identified with the heads of clans and tribes in their function overseeing the mustered men. The notion emerging here of attributing a *nāśî'* to each tribe (7:3,10,12-88) is also found in 1:4; 2. As far as literary-critical considerations involving 1:1-47 are concerned, one can determine that initially Moses alone received the order for mustering. After this order was extended to Aaron, further textual redaction introduced men in supporting roles. Nu. 1:16,44 then made these men into *n*ᵉ*śî'îm.* This redaction can still be discerned on the basis of the singular verbs in 1:19,44.[26] The same thing is evident also in 4:34,46; 31:13 (cf. Josh. 22:30,32).

Nu. 3:14-39 offers a slightly different view of the *nāśî'* in connection with the mustering of the sons of Levi. Here the *nāśî'* is the head of several families tracing their lineage back to the same patronymic. Three *n*ᵉ*śî'îm* are enumerated for the tribe of Levi (3:24,30,35). The individual families are called *bêṯ 'āḇ*,[27] and the head of the *n*ᵉ*śî'îm* themselves bears the title *n*ᵉ*śî' n*ᵉ*śî'îm hallēwî* (3:32).

The differing functions of the *n*ᵉ*śî'îm* in Numbers elucidate the increasing esteem accorded those who bear the title, from census assistants to military leaders to chiefs over the Levite groups.[28] The *n*ᵉ*śî'îm* enjoy the highest esteem where they function as representatives of the twelve tribes (Nu. 1:4; 2; 7:2f.,10,12-88; 17:17,21[2,6]; 27:2; 31:13). Any conclusion prompted by this and by Gen. 17:20 and 25:16 (the twelve *n*ᵉ*śî'îm* of Ishmael) that there were tribal emissaries absolving the business of an amphictyonic sanctuary is not supported by sufficient evidence.[29] Furthermore, one must remember that the *nāśî'* conception of P actually constitutes a projection back to the wilderness period, a projection itself lacking unity concerning the functions it at-

---

24. Contra Lang, 180.

25. Calderini, *BeO* 20 (1978) 126; a different view is taken by Irwin, *AJSL* 57 (1940) 97: "announcers of the festivals."

26. Cf. Kellermann, 4-17.

27. Cf. ibid., 4f.

28. Cf. ibid., 148; Rost, 74f.

29. Contra Noth, *System,* 162; cf. van der Ploeg, 49; Mayes, 162; Irwin, *RB* 72 (1965) 169, 182-84; de Vaux.

tributes to the *nāśî'*. In its treatment of the sending of the spies, Nu. 13:2 is again based on the notion of according to every tribe its own *nāśî'*, though here the reference is to persons other than those enumerated in the *nāśî'* lists, suggesting a more comprehensive *nāśî'* concept. Traces of this can also be found in 16:2, which speaks of 250 *n^e śî'îm*. Here the reference is probably to chiefs of individual clans.[30] This also applies to the Simeonite *nāśî'* mentioned in 25:14 as well as to the Midianite *nāśî'* mentioned in v. 18.

In their juridical function the *n^e śî'îm* appear together with Moses and the priest Eleazar (Nu. 27:2; 31:13) as a panel before which disputes are adjudicated. They are similarly involved in the land allotment (32:2), where they are in part identified with the *rā'šîm* (thus the *n^e śî'îm* in 32:2 are referred to in vv. 28-30 as *rā'šîm*, and the *n^e śî'îm* in 34:16-29 appear in Josh. 14:1 as *rā'šê-'āḇôṯ*).

The only passage involving *nāśî'* in Leviticus addresses the unwitting transgression of a *nāśî'* (4:22-26). A distinction is made between the transgression of the high priest (vv. 3-12), the congregation (vv. 13-21), the *nāśî'* (vv. 22-26), and the common people (vv. 27-35). The atonement sacrifice for the transgression of the *nāśî'* is to be a goat, i.e., the sacrifice of the highest representative of the people during the wilderness period (cf. Ezk. 45:22).[31] Only through the insertion of this passage into the context of the Priestly historical work is the highest representative of the people designated here as *nāśî'*. Considering the terminology of atoning sacrifice, *nāśî'*, and *'am-hā'āreṣ*, one perceives in the background here the *nāśî'* conception of the torah of Ezekiel, in particular that of Ezk. 45:21–46:12, albeit with the difference that in Leviticus *nāśî'* appears without the article and is associated with the tribal princes.[32]

The juridical function of the *n^e śî'îm* is also illustrated by Josh. 22:14,30,32. This text was reworked by P, the *n^e śî'îm* entering the text in the process, where they replaced older terms referring to the tribal representatives.[33] A dispute regarding the construction of an altar by the Transjordanian tribes is brought before the priest Phinehas and ten tribal *n^e śî'îm*. The addition of *bêṯ 'āḇ*[34] to the *n^e śî'îm* (v. 14) shifts this office from the tribal level to that of the clan. The parallel positioning with *rā'šê 'alpê yiśrā'ēl* identifies them as leaders of military detachments (v. 30). The *n^e śî'îm* decide the case, and the priest announces the decision (22:31f.).

The 4 *nāśî'* occurrences in Genesis also belong to P.[35] In Gen. 17:20 Ishmael is promised numerous descendants; he will be the father of twelve *n^e śî'îm* and so become a great nation (25:16). In 23:6 the Hittites, from whom Abraham wants to acquire a burial place, refer to him as *n^e śî' '^e lōhîm*. He sees himself as *gēr w^e tôšāḇ* (23:4), with which he gives expression to his lack of rights as an alien. Over against this, his desig-

30. Ebach, 49 n. 16.

31. Cf. K. Elliger, *Leviticus*. *HAT* I/4 (1966), 72, who perceives in this series "already a certain devaluation" of the *nāśî'* in the postexilic period.

32. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*. *Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 539. Cf. Elliger, *Leviticus*, 72.

33. Cf. Soggin, *Judges*, 215.

34. *BHS* suggests deleting this addition.

35. Cf. Calderini, *BeO* 20 (1978) 69f.

nation as *n^eśî' 'elōhîm* expresses respectful acknowledgment.[36] But the root *nś'* does not allow the conclusion that God brought Abraham into the land, a more likely connection being that with Akk. *niš īnē* (a lifting up of the eyes) in the sense of being elevated or exalted by the deity.[37]

In the meaning "prince" the term *nāśî'* is applied in Gen. 34:2 to Hamor or Shechem. He bears the title *neśî' hā-'āreṣ* and represents the head of a Canaanite city. The confusion regarding the person to whom the title actually refers derives from the fact that in 34:1-34 two different narratives have been amalgamated into a third.[38]

Within the Deuteronomistic history one *nāśî'* occurrence is in 1 K. 8:1, a passage attributable to a P redactor. The *neśî'ê hā'āḇôṯ* mentioned here are the heads of extended families; in their position parallel to the *rā'šîm* they represent an interpretation carried through by P of the *ziqnê yiśrā'ēl* (cf. Nu. 3:30,35).[39]

Altogether we can discern four functions for the title *nāśî'* as understood by P. It refers to the tribal leader (Nu. 1:4; 2; 7:3,10,12-88; 34:18,23-28), the chief of a clan (3:24,30,35; 4:34; 17:17,21[2,6]; 25:14; 34:25; 1 K. 8:1; 2 Ch. 5:2), the military leader (Nu. 10:4), and in general the title of a respected or exalted person (Gen. 23:6; 34:2; Ex. 35:27; Nu. 16:2; 27:2; 32:2; Josh. 22:30). The concepts of the "clan leader" and "tribal head" sometimes overlap (Nu. 1:16,44; 4:46; 7:2; 17:17,21[2,6]; 36:1; Josh. 22:14).

In Ezekiel we find the basic meaning "one who is elevated, exalted," with various nuances. Thus in Ezk. 1–39 *nāśî'* refers to princes in the general sense, as in 7:27 (*meleḵ* has been added here; it is not attested in the LXX)[40] and in 32:29. The title is associated in 19:1 with Jehoiachin, and in 34:24 and 37:25 with the coming ruler. In addition, both the king of Judah (7:27; 12:10,12; 21:17,30[12,25]; 22:6) and lesser foreign kings (26:16; 27:21; 30:13; 32:29; 38:2f.; 39:1,18) are designated as *nāśî'*. In this context the title *neśî' rō'š* also appears (38:2f.; 39:1), referring to the first in a series of princes.[41] The LXX misunderstands *rō'š* here as the proper name of a country *(árchonta Rōs)*. Greater foreign kings receive the title *meleḵ*, as do the king of Babylon (17:12; 19:9; 21:24,26[19,21], and elsewhere) and the pharaoh (29:3; 30:21f.; 31:2f.; 32:2). In 30:13 (a passage not attributable to Ezekiel) the title is given to the pharaoh.[42]

On balance Ezk. 1–39 makes a clear distinction between lesser rulers and powerful kings, whereby the king of Judah receives the *nāśî'* title probably not because of his status as a vassal but because of the connection here with the P terminology *neśî'ê yiśrā'ēl* (Nu. 1:44; 4:46; 7:2,84; and Ezk. 19:1; 21:17[12]; 22:6; 45:9, as well as the singular in 21:30[25]).[43]

---

36. Ibid., 65f.; C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1985), 373.
37. Contra Gottstein, 298ff.; see *AHw*, 797; Ebach, 54f.
38. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 536.
39. See Noth, *Könige*, 176f.; on the ellipse involving *bêṯ* see 171.
40. Cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 200.
41. Speiser, 113; Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 305: "chief prince."
42. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 127f. Cf. also Ebach, 46 n. 6.
43. See Ebach, 48. Cf. Rost, 72f.; Procksch, 116.

The ruler of the salvific future, who also receives the title *nāśî'*, plays a special role in the torah of Ezekiel (chs. 40–48). Only he is permitted to sit in the east gate of the temple and eat bread before Yahweh (44:3). Here *'el hannāśî'* ("concerning the *nāśî'*") should probably be prefaced as a superscription in order to resolve the text-critical problem.[44]

The *nāśî'* is not permitted to enter by way of the east gate into the inner court, which was generally accessible for prayer (46:2f.); rather, he must remain at the post of the gate, while the people remain at the entrance of the gate structure. Similarly, the *nāśî'*, in contrast to the people, is to go out through the same gate through which he enters (46:8-10). One should assume that 44:1-3 is a redactional addendum dependent on 46:1-12.[45]

In the reallocation of the land the *nāśî'* receives his portion on either side of the Yahweh precinct (45:7f.; 48:21f.).[46] Since the *nāśî'* is responsible for the various offerings (45:17,22), the people are to make deliveries to him for carrying out these offerings (45:13-16). The *nāśî'* does not himself bring any offerings but rather merely attends the offerings presented by the priests (46:2,4,12), since he is only a member of the congregation.[47] The result is that here the priests are no longer subject to civil authority.[48]

The disputed question involves just who is meant by the term *nāśî'* in chs. 40–48. Is the reference here to the future king from the house of David,[49] or is Ezekiel using this title to express his rejection of the monarchy itself? In any event, one can discern here a limitation, associated with messianic hopes,[50] of the claims of kingship. One can no longer determine, however, whether Ezekiel is merely picking up an older title in order to express (as is the case in 1 K. 11:34) the maintenance of the Davidic line over the remnant of Israel,[51] even if this may have played some role in his choice of titles.

Regulations concerning land allocation (Ezk. 45:8; 48:21) and inheritance (46:18) prevent infringements on the part of the *nāśî'* that kings had earlier committed.[52] One cannot completely resolve the question whether, analogous to the distinction between *meleḵ* and *nāśî'* in Ezk. 1–39, the choice of the title in chs. 40–48 is implying that a future king is to be subject to the king of one of the greater powers.[53] It seems more likely that Ezekiel is placing the last kings of Judah into a specific historical context. One notices that the designation *n^eśî'ê yiśrā'ēl* functions in negatively colored contexts dealing with accusation (22:6), judgment (7:27; 12:10,12; 21:30[25]), and grief (7:27; 19:1; 21:17[12]). Thus the designation of the kings of Israel as *nāśî'* implies an

---

44. Cf. G. J. Botterweck, "Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Ez xliv 3a," *VT* 1 (1951) 145f.
45. Gese, 86f.; Procksch, 112f.; Vogt, 157-60.
46. Cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2,* 535.
47. Zimmerli, "Plans," 125; idem, *Ezekiel 2,* 550f. Cf. Procksch, 117.
48. Cf. A. Cody, *A History of OT Priesthood. AnBibl* 35 (1969), 176f.
49. Seybold, 146f.
50. Lang, 180; Levenson, 67.
51. Caquot, 19f.
52. Macholz, 337f.; Zimmerli, "Plans," 124.
53. Procksch, 116; Ebach, 281 n. 4; a different view is taken by Gese, 118f.

historico-theological view in which the bad *n^e śî'îm* are contrasted with the ideal portrayal of the *nāśî'* in chs. 40–48. Within these final chapters one should differentiate between a *nāśî'* stratum in 44:1-3; 45:21f.; 46:1-10,12, which views the *nāśî'* positively, and secondary passages that seek to limit the power of the *nāśî'* (45:8b,9; 46:16-18).[54] In this context the prescription in 44:1-3 was only retroactively expanded to include the *nāśî'*.[55] Furthermore, one can ascertain that by referring back to the title *nāśî'* Ezekiel is evoking an older social order, one preceding statehood.[56] This can be seen in that the *nāśî'* is viewed together with the *'am hā'āreṣ* (45:16,22; 46:2-3,8-9), the expression Ezekiel uses to refer to the entire people;[57] he does this in order to do away with the social stratification of the preexilic period.

c. *Postexilic.* Ezr. 1:8 refers to Sheshbazzar as the *nāśî'* of Judah, by which one should understand the ruler of the province Judah.[58] This creates tension with Ezr. 5:14, where one reads that Nebuchadnezzar had installed Sheshbazzar as governor.[59] According to Procksch,[60] Sheshbazzar is a *nāśî'* by birth and governor by appointment, so that he combined both titles in one person, something that after him was no longer the case. One can, however, adduce 1 Ch. 2:10 and 5:6 against the assertion of the inherited nature of the *nāśî'* title, since there one finds that the father of a *nāśî'* did not bear this title.[61] It is more likely, then, that use of the *nāśî'* title in Ezr. 1:8 derives from the influence of the torah of Ezekiel; through this title Sheshbazzar was to become the guarantor of Ezekiel's hopes.[62]

The 4 *nāśî'* occurrences in 1 Chronicles summarize passages from the Pentateuch and refer to the heads of families (1 Ch. 4:38; 7:40) or to the tribal head (1 Ch. 2:10; 5:6) as *nāśî'*. The 2 occurrences in 2 Ch. 1:2; 5:2 also refer to the heads of families.

The title *nāśî'* lived on in the leadership of the Sanhedrin, whose head bore this title, while the person occupying the second position was designated as *'āḇ bêṯ dîn.*[63] This is explained by the fact that during the postexilic period the high priest had acquired significant honorific features of the *nāśî'*, features that after the elimination of the theocracy under the Hasmoneans passed to the principal leader of the Sanhedrin, since he exercised the highest religious authority over all Jews.[64]

III. Qumran. Among the Qumran writings the title occurs primarily in 1QM. In 5:1 it refers to the leader of the sons of light in their war against the sons of darkness. In this context he is joined by the *kōhēn hārō'š* (1QM 2:1; 15:4; 16:13; 18:5; 19:11).

---

54. With Gese, 110; and Procksch, 121f. A different view is taken by Ebach, 204f.
55. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 439.
56. Ibid., 218; Ebach, 57.
57. Ebach, 70f.
58. Japhet, 97f.
59. Cf. Japhet, 98.
60. Pp. 120f.
61. Ebach, 52 n. 30.
62. Rost, 75.
63. Zeitlin, 1.
64. See Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2*, 539f.; Zeitlin, 4f.

These two persons are not to be taken as messianic figures from David and Aaron, since the *n^eśî kol-hā'ēḏâ* in 1QM only appears here, with no further significance.[65] The twelve *n^eśî'îm* also appear in 1QM as leaders of the tribes (3:3,15), and in the same passages are also called *n^eśî'ê 'ēl* or *śārîm.* To these one can add the notion of the *nāśî'* as leader of a unit of ten thousand (1QM 3:16). That in 1QM 5:1 the twelve leaders of the tribes bear the title *śar* implies a fundamental equivalence between *nāśî'* and *śar* in Qumran.[66] This is also the case in the *nāśî'* passages in the Temple Scroll (21:5; 42:14; 57:12).

The *n^eśî hā'ēḏâ* appears in 1QSb 5:20, viewed as a secular ruler (cf. CD 7:20; 4QpIsa[a] [4Q161] frs. 5-6:3), though here, in contrast to 1QM 5:1, he is anticipated as a messianic figure (cf. 1QSa 2:11f.). This becomes especially clear in the messianic attributes drawn from Isa. 11.[67] CD 7:20 views him as the *n^eśî' kol hā'ēḏâ* and as the scepter out of Israel (cf. Nu. 24:17). CD 5:1 goes back to Dt. 17:17 and replaces David's royal title with *nāśî'*.

The title *n^eśî' rō'š,* already attested in Ezk. 38:2f.; 39:1, appears in 4QShirShabb[d] (4Q403) 1:10,17,18f.,21,23f.,26 in reference to seven different figures whose task is the blessing of the righteous. These *n^eśî'îm* are archangels (cf. Tob. 12:15).

The title *n^eśî' yiśrā'ēl,* which is attested only in Ezk. 21:30 in the singular, is resurrected under Bar Kokhba, and is found here also in the form *nāśî'*.[68]

On the whole, the Qumran witnesses exhibit no deviation from OT usage. The connection with the *nāśî'* conception of P is clear in the formulation *n^eśî (kol) hā'ēḏâ* (compare Nu. 1:44,46; 4:34; Josh. 22:30 with 1QM 5:1; 7:20; 1QSb 5:20; CD 7:20). Regarding the expression *n^eśî' 'ēl* (1QM 3:3) cf. Gen. 26:3, and for *n^eśî' rō'š* (Ezk. 38:2f.; 39:1) cf. the passages from the Angelic Liturgy (4QShirShabb[d]).

Niehr

65. Weiss, 359-62.
66. Van der Ploeg; Rouleau, 87.
67. Cf. Weiss, 354.
68. For the former see *Les Grottes de Murabba'ât. DJD,* II (1961), 24 D 3; F 3; G 3. For the latter see B 3, 9; C 3; D 18; E 2, 7.

נשׂא *nś'* I

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Hiphil. III. Niphal. IV. LXX.

I. Etymology. The etymology of *nś'* I (hiphil, "to deceive") is unclear. P. de Lagarde's conjecture that it might derive from the term for "usury" was early rejected;

instead, scholars take it as a secondary form of → שׁוא *šw'*.[1] The better suggestion is probably that of *GesB,* which derives the hiphil directly from *šw';* the niphal form (with only 1 occurrence) would then constitute a secondary construction.

II. Hiphil. Of the 12 occurrences of the hiphil, 5 refer to the Assyrian propaganda to Hezekiah during Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem. According to 2 K. 18:29 par. Isa. 36:14, the Assyrian commander Rabshakeh says to the inhabitants of Jerusalem: "Do not let Hezekiah deceive you *('al-yaššî' lākem hizqîyāhû),* for he will not be able to deliver you." 2 Ch. 32:15 adds *swt* hiphil as a parallel. He thus insinuates that Hezekiah has sustained his people with false hopes, and continues: "Do not let Hezekiah make you to rely (falsely) (*bāṭaḥ* hiphil) on Yahweh" (v. 30). A bit later Sennacherib sends messengers to Hezekiah himself and has them say: "Do not let your God on whom you rely 'deceive' you into believing that Jerusalem will not be given into the hand of the king of Assyria" (2 K. 19:10 par. Isa. 37:10). Thus both cases focus on persuading someone into a false sense of security. This is also the case in Jer. 4:10, though in a completely different situation, since here the prophet accuses God himself of having seriously deceived the people by promising them well-being. In Jer. 37:9 the prophet says: "Do not deceive yourselves, saying, 'The Chaldeans will surely stay away from us.'" Those are false hopes, "for they will not stay away." Jer. 29:8 is also concerned with false hopes: The prophets of good news have apparently enticed the exiles with visions of quick return, which according to Jeremiah's own judgment in v. 31 has awakened false confidence in them *(wayyabṭāḥ 'eṯkem 'al-šāqer).*

Jer. 49:16 is almost identical with Ob. 3. According to the first passage, the terrors the Edomites have prompted among their enemies and the pride of their own hearts have deceived them into thinking they are invincible, while the latter passage speaks only of pride of heart — thus again a false sense of security and false hopes. Ob. 7 asserts that the allies and friends *('anšê šālôm)* of the Edomites deceived them and then overpowered them; thus through feigned friendship they deceived their partners into thinking they had nothing to fear.

Against this background the earliest witness (Gen. 3:13, J) is self-explanatory. The serpent deceived the first two human beings into thinking that if they ate from the tree of knowledge, they would become like God; it turns out, however, that this hope was completely false.

III. Niphal. The single occurrence of the niphal accords well with this picture. In an oracle of judgment on Egypt the prophet announces the inner dissolution of Egypt (Isa. 19:13): "The princes of Zoan have become fools (*y'l* niphal), and the princes of Memphis are deluded"; the Egyptians have been led astray (*tā'â* hiphil) by their own princes.

---

1. Lagarde, *Übersicht über die im Aramäischen, Arabischen und Hebräischen übliche Bildung der Nomina* (1889; repr. Osnabrück, 1972), 196. Cf. *GesB*, 526; *HAL,* II, 728, though with a question mark.

IV. LXX. The LXX usually translates with *apatáō,* though in 2 K. and Ob. 3 with *epaírō.* Elsewhere *hypolambánō* and *anapeíthō* are used. In Isa. 19:13 the LXX reads a form of *nś' (hypsōthḗnai),* and in Ob. 7 it reads the verb as a form of *nś'* III, "to attack" (this meaning does indeed occur in Ps. 55:16[Eng. v. 15] and 89:23[22]).

Ringgren

נָשָׁא *nāšā'* II; נשה *nšh;* מַשָּׁא *maššā';* מַשָּׁאוֹת *maššā'ōṯ;* נְשִׁי *n^e šî*

Contents: I. 1. Semitic Parallels; 2. LXX; 3. Qumran. II. 1. Occurrences and Meaning; 2. OT Legal Contexts; 3. Semantic Field.

I. 1. *Semitic Parallels.* The root *nš'* is attested in many Semitic languages, though its derivation is complicated by the change of radicals *s/š, '/h,* and *n/r.*[1] Hebrew alternates between *nš'* and *nšh* with no difference in meaning. Despite morphological correspondence, no semantic correspondence need also obtain.

Arabic attests *nasa'a* and *nāsa'a* in the sense of "to postpone payment," "to fix a term for debt," or "to give credit"; the accompanying noun is *nasi'a.*[2] Old South Arabic attests *ns'* with the same meaning.[3] In both Syriac and Jewish Aramaic *nš'* means "to forget."[4] Jewish Aramaic renders the subst. "lending" with *nšh* or *rš'.*[5] Here the con-

---

nāšā'. H. J. Boecker, *Law and the Administration of Justice in the OT and Ancient Near East* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1980); I. Cardellini, *Die biblischen "Sklaven"-Gesetze. BBB* 55 (1981); S. Cavalletti, "Il significato di mashsheh yad in Deut 15,2," *Antonianum* 31 (1965) 301-4; H. Cazelles, *Études sur le Code d'Alliance* (Paris, 1946), 79f.; A. Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitsgesetz und Deuteronomium. AnBibl* 66 (1976); F. Crüsemann, *Widerstand gegen das Königtum. WMANT* 49 (1978); L. Epsztein, *Social Justice in the Ancient Near East and the People of the Bible* (Eng. trans., London, 1986), 124-28; F. C. Fensham, "Widow, Orphan, and the Poor in Ancient Near Eastern Legal and Wisdom Literature," *JNES* 21 (1962) 129-39; H. Gamoran, "The Biblical Law Against Loan on Interest," *JNES* 30 (1971) 127-34; F. Horst, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes. FRLANT* 45 (1930), 56-78; H. G. Kippenberg, *Religion und Klassenbildung im antiken Judäa* (Göttingen, ²1982); E. Klingenberg, "Das israelitische Zinsverbot in Torah, Mischna und Talmud," *AAWLM.G* 7 (1977), 5-102; E. Neufeld, "The Prohibitions Against Loans," *HUCA* 26 (1955) 355-412; J. P. M. van der Ploeg, "Les Pauvres d'Israel," *OTS* 7 (1950) 236-70; M. Schwantes, *Das Recht der Armen. BBET* 4 (1977); R. K. Sikkema, "De Lening in het OT" (diss., The Hague, 1957); S. Stein, "The Laws on Interest," *JTS,* N.S. 4 (1953) 161-70; E. Szlechter, "Le Prêt dans l'AT," *RHPR* 35 (1955) 16-25.

1. On the first see S. Moscati, *An Intro. to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. PLO,* N.S. 6 (²1969), 34; F. M. Fales, "A Cuneiform Correspondence to Alphabetic ש," *Or* 47 (1978) 91. On the second see Moscati, 42; Beyer, 42. On the third see Moscati, 32.
2. Lane, s.v.
3. Biella, 307.
4. For Syriac see *CSD,* 352; for Jewish Aramaic see *ANH,* s.v.; *WTM,* s.v.
5. Cf. Dalman; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 337f.

nection between "to forget" and the special case, namely, the "forgetting of the date of payment" by the creditor, expresses itself linguistically as well. *HAL* gives *rāšû,* "creditor," as the Akkadian equivalent.[6] Considering the morphological correspondence, the connection with Aramaic does not present any problems. In addition to *rāšû,* Akkadian also attests *rašû,* "to receive, acquire," in the sense of "earning interest," in the Š stem, and the derivative *rašûtu,* "a loan."

2. *LXX.* The LXX translates *nš'* according to context with varying verbs, since it finds no blanket equivalent. This reflects the difficulties involved in translating the term unequivocally.[7]

3. *Qumran.* The root is not attested in Qumran, and in postbiblical texts it occurs only in biblical citations. That the word for "to borrow, loan," is exclusively → לוה *lwh* indicates that the *nš'* connection was no longer familiar.[8]

II. 1. *Occurrences and Meaning.* In general, most passages are translated with "to grant a loan, to loan," though the meaning "to practice usury" is also offered.[9] The present discussion intends to examine individual passages to show not only that this latter meaning applies to all passages, but also that it should be made even more incisive in the sense of personal attachment.

Ex. 22:24(Eng. v. 25) (LXX *katepeígein*) contains one of the three prohibitions against interest in the Pentateuch (Lev. 25:35-38; Dt. 23:20f.). The believer is prohibited from being like a *nōšeh.* The construction of the overall passage is a parenetically altered casuistic legal principle, with the prohibitive functioning as the apodosis. The term *nš'* is set off against *lwh*: *nš'* must be prohibited for the sake of protecting the poor. The motivation given is both Yahweh's compassion for the affected group *('ammî)* and group solidarity *('ānî 'immāḵ).* The intention of this law is thus to insure financial support for the poor person, which according to the text he needs for securing the necessities of life (cf. v. 26[27]), without granting *nšk,* i.e., without any advantage to the creditor.[10] Thus here as well as in the following passage (Dt. 15:2, LXX *opheílein*) the reference is not to commercial loans of the kind familiar from Mesopotamia but rather to consumer credit to be given to the poor without speculative interest.[11]

Dt. 15:2 deals with the law concerning the *šᵉmiṭṭâ* year. The construction *ba'al maššēh yāḏô* is of particular importance here. Horst suggests that *yāḏô* refers to the borrower as the one who has had to accept a loan into his hand.[12] By means of a handshake the creditor acquires access to the person and finances. A guarantor (cf. Prov.

---

6. P. 687, with reference to *AHw,* II, 962.
7. Concerning the LXX translation, cf. II.1 below and the discussion of individual passages.
8. Horst, 68.
9. Cf. *GesB* and *HAL,* s.v.
10. → לוה *lāwâ* II (VII, 477-78).
11. Cf. Gamoran, 131; Horst, 58.
12. Horst, 59.

22:26, which in this context uses the subst. *maššā'ôṯ*, derived from *nš'*), takes the borrower's hand out of that of the creditor and subjects himself to the creditor's control.[13] Other authors insert *maššeh 'ēṯ* and thus translate: "Every holder of a pledge [shall release] the pledge of his hand."[14] In this case the hand is that of the creditor (cf. Ger. *Faustpfand*). In view of Neh. 10:32(31) this seems the more probable interpretation.

The next question concerns the quality of the pledge. As the overall context shows, the person in question is poor; as already was the case in Ex. 22:24(25), however, he is able to pledge only the bare necessities of life, or, as it were, his life. The consequence of noncompliance is thus in any case bondage or slavery. This also explains why the position at the outset is a legal interpretation of the *šᵉmiṭṭâ* regulation (v. 1) with respect to a slave. "The *mšh* is a pledged person who can be a slave, a family member, or the debtor himself,"[15] and the creditor's earnings consist in the work performed by his "pledge."[16] This interpretation is strengthened by the use of → נגשׂ *nāgaś* in v. 3, which has the sense of "imposing compulsory service on a person pledged in this way."[17] This renders moot the question concerning the kind of release. The reference is not to the remission of the loan[18] or of interest; the release consists in a renunciation of one's claim to the pledge, the motivation being the "suspension of all social disruption and need,"[19] something strengthened by the concept of the brother.

The prescription in Dt. 24:10f. (LXX *opheílēma/dáneion*) addresses one's rights concerning the pledge. These verses reach back thematically (property) beyond vv. 8f. to vv. 6f.: neither handmill nor millstone may be taken in pledge, and the stealing of a person for the purpose of sale into slavery is prohibited. In this context vv. 10f. curtail the creditor's rights of seizure concerning his debtor. Although *nš'* initially evokes the notion of personal attachment, which is why the debtor is given with the prep. *bᵉ*,[20] the present context seems to be referring to a pledge of movable goods. A look at v. 13 (cf. Ex. 22:24[25]), however, shows that these are pledges touching on the life and personal dignity of the debtor. These prescriptions are to protect a person's basic needs.[21]

The next passage, 1 S. 22:2 (LXX *hypóchreōs*), identifies "those who were in *nōše*'" as members of David's troops. Because of personal attachment the reference here is to "a person who has escaped either actual or imminent debtor's bondage."[22]

In 1 K. 8:31 (LXX *lábę̄*) the interpretation of *nš'* must take as its point of departure a

---

13. Cf. Horst, 63.

14. A. D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy. NCBC* (1979), 248; J. A. Thompson, *Deuteronomy. TOTC* (²1976), in loc.; R. P. Merendino, *Das deuteronomische Gesetz. BBB* 31 (1969), 108; Cavalletti, 303; *BHS*.

15. Cardellini, 270.

16. Cf. Cholewiński, 224; Cazelles, 79f.

17. Cholewiński, 219.

18. Thompson, in loc.; Schwantes, 66.

19. L. Perlitt, "Ein einzig Volk von Brüdern," *Kirche. FS G. Bornkamm* (Tübingen, 1980), 33. Cf. Kippenberg, 74.

20. Horst, 61.

21. Boecker, 183.

22. Crüsemann, 139.

reversal of the supralinear dot, resulting in the reading *nś' bᵉ*.[23] The same applies to the parallel passage (2 Ch. 6:22).

2 K. 4:1 (LXX *daneistḗs*) describes the steps taken by a *nōšeh* in the case of a tardy debtor: He takes the debtor's children as slaves! This shows quite clearly that a *nšh* creditor's rights of access were maximal. In v. 7 *(tókos)* the derivative subst. *nᵉšî* refers to the debt with personal attachment.

In Neh. 5 *nš'* or *nšh* occurs 3 times in rapid succession (vv. 7,10,11; LXX *apaiteín, apaítēsis, ekphérein*). The text enumerates virtually all the possibilities and consequences of such loan seizure: v. 2 — children are pledged; v. 3 — immovable goods are pledged; vv. 4f. — immovable goods are pledged, children taken into slavery in order to make payments; v. 8 — compatriots fall into debt slavery in this way; vv. 10f. — for loans and grain the possessions of the debtor pass into the hands of the creditor; the debtor must provide further payments.

The basic tenor of all forms of loan seizure is complete dependence on the creditor that can extend even to the sale of one's family and to the pledge of oneself into slavery. Even when "merely" the debtor's goods are pledged (vv. 4f.,11), the result is still bondage, since the debtors must then work their former property in order to fulfill the requirements of the debt (v. 11).[24] The coupling of high interest rates with the institution of personal attachment, against the background of Babylonian lending practice, leads during the time of Nehemiah to a situation in which all loans have the tendency to result in the personal bondage of the debtor.[25] The protocol confirmation of the remission of debt circumstances is in 10:32(31) (LXX *apaítēsis*), where the derivative *maššā'* is used. The construction with *yāḏ* establishes a connection with Dt. 15:2.

Among the Psalms, the term *nōšeh* appears in 109:11 (LXX *saneistḗs*), where the verb *nqš* gives it a pronounced negative qualification: The *nōšeh* is a person who seizes all that a person has. Isa. 24:2 (LXX *opheílein*) confirms the difference between *nš'* and *lwh*: "normal lending" *(lwh)* is mentioned first in the series, then the *nš'* relationship. In the chain of comparisons, both concluding constructions mention first the creditor, then the borrower dependent on him.[26]

In conclusion the two passages from Jeremiah should be mentioned. The asseveration of innocence in Jer. 15:10 (LXX *opheílein*) is comprehensible only if *nšh* does not refer to simple "lending" but rather precisely to an unjust form, i.e., usury or personal attachment.[27]

Jer. 23:39 involves another instance of confusion with *nś'*, something confirmed by

---

23. M. Rehm, *Das erste Buch der Könige* (Würzburg, 1979), in loc.; E. Würthwein, *Das erste Buch der Könige 1–16. ATD* 11/1 (1976), in loc.; *BHS*.

24. Cf. Kippenberg, 57f., 73.

25. Sikkema, 37.

26. Cf. W. Elder, "A Theological Study of Isaiah 24–27" (diss., Baylor, 1974), 25; P. Redditt, "Isaiah 24–27: A Form-Critical Analysis" (diss., Vanderbilt, 1972); W. R. Millar, *Isaiah 24–27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic. HSM* 11 (1976), 25; a different view is taken by H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1997), in loc.

27. Cf. F. Hubmann, *Untersuchungen zu den Konfessionen. FzB* 30 (1978), 260.

many mss., the translation of the LXX *(lambánein),* and the reference back to *maśśā'* (v. 38). The expression *'eṯkem nāšō',* following on *nāšîṯî* in v. 39a, is completely missing in the LXX.[28]

2. *OT Legal Contexts.* As the discussion of the various passages has shown, *nš'/nšh* refers in all cases to a particularly unscrupulous, profit-oriented form of lending directed specifically at one's needy fellow citizens. Since the borrower needs the loan to provide for basic necessities (consumer credit), he generally can offer as a pledge *(maššā')* only his land, from whose yield he nourishes himself, and his own life or that of his children (personal attachment). Since through the *nš'* relationship the creditor enjoys maximal rights of seizure over against the borrower, the virtually unavoidable result is personal bondage or sale into slavery. The campaign against this form of lending is justified on the basis of social ("your brother") and theological ("one of Yahweh's people") considerations.

3. *Semantic Field.* The general term for "lending" in the OT is *lwh.* An equivalent to *lwh* is the rarely used → עבט *'āḇaṭ* hiphil. Since the OT speaks primarily about consumer loans, the form of lending stipulated is interest-free *lwh*: "lending based on solidarity with the poor." As an analogy to *lwh,* Roman law understands *mutuum* as interest-free solidarity loan. In contrast, *nexum* refers to the loan the rich grants to the poor for interest, partially analogous to *nš'.* Juxtaposed with the other verbs mentioned, the decisive element characterizing *nš'* is the interest in profit and speculation. A term closely related with *nš'* is → נשך *nšk,* which means "to take interest" or, as a substantive, "interest." The texts dealing with interest describe the creditor in a way similar to that of the *nš'* texts. Both occur in the same passage, Ex. 22:24. It is thus probable that the loan-pledge contract *(nš')* could in general be amplified further by interest.[29] The two verbs describe the same circumstance of debt from different angles of vision; whereas *nš'* emphasizes the pledge, *nšk* focuses on the interest.

Release from debtor status is expressed by the terms *šmṭ* and *gā'al.*

Hossfeld — Reuter

---

28. Cf. A. Weiser, *Das Buch Jeremia 1–25,14. ATD* 20 (^{8}1981), in loc.; W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (^{3}1968), in loc.

29. Cf. Sikkema, 25, 37.

נָשָׁה *nāšâ*; נְשִׁיָּה *nᵉšîyâ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences. III. OT Usage. IV. LXX.

I. Etymology. The Heb. *nāšâ,* "to forget," corresponds to Ugar. *nšy,* "to neglect," Jewish Aramaic *nᵉšâ,* Syr. *nᵉšāʾ,* Arab. *nasiya,* and Eth. *tanāsaya,* all "forget."[1] Old South Arabic also attests an occurrence, and Akk. *mašû* is comparable.[2]

II. Occurrences. The verb *nāšâ* occurs 5 times in the OT, once each in the qal, niphal, and piel, and twice in the hiphil. In addition, the noun *nᵉšîyâ* occurs once.

III. OT Usage. The qal occurs in Lam. 3:17: "You have driven my *nep̱eš* from *šālôm,* I have forgotten what is good." The second clause could be paraphrased with "I have forgotten what happiness is" (so RSV). Whether one maintains the first verb in the 2nd person or emends it to the 3rd person to establish congruence with what precedes it, in any event the verse asserts that Yahweh has cut the poet off from his earlier happiness; it seems to him as if that happiness never really existed. In this case "to forget" means almost the same as "never to experience."

The occurrence of the niphal (Isa. 44:21) is linguistically difficult insofar as the passive verb takes a (dative?) suffix.[3] Maintaining the MT yields the translation: "Israel, you will not be forgotten by me." Textual emendation is hardly advisable, since the MT yields good sense. Israel is Yahweh's servant, formed *(yṣr)* by him, and will thus not be forgotten by him or left in the lurch.

The piel occurs only in Gen. 41:51 in the folk-etymological explanation of the name Manasseh: "God has made me forget all my hardship and all my father's house."

The hiphil occurs in 2 passages, both in Job. Job 39:17 asserts that God has made the ostrich forget wisdom, since she leaves her eggs to the earth without considering that they might easily be trampled. The synonymous verb *šāḵaḥ* is used: She forgets that a foot can crush them. M. Dahood refers to the par. *ḥālaq,* "to give a share," and suggests that *nāšâ* thus be understood to mean "to lend."[4]

Job 11:6b is difficult. The context includes the wish that God speak and give Job instruction. In what follows attention is directed toward the difficulty in recognizing and comprehending God. The sentence *wᵉḏaʿ kî-yaššeh lᵉḵā ʾᵉlôah meʿᵃwōneḵā* seems to interrupt the context. If, however, *min* is being used partitively, and *nšh* hiphil means "to grant forgetfulness," then one might translate: "Know then, that (for you) God

1. For Ugaritic see *WUS,* no. 1863. The Old Aramaic in *KAI,* 223A:4 is an uncertain addendum.

2. See W. W. Müller, "Altsüdarabische Beiträge zum Hebräischen Lexikon," *ZAW* 75 (1963) 312; *VG,* I, 160.

3. Cf. *GK,* §§57 n. 2; 117x.

4. "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 337f.

gives much of your guilt over to forgetfulness." In other words, "the person to whom God reveals his hidden and wise actions will learn more than that God holds a person accountable for all guilt. Rather, that person will realize how much all of God's chastising acts are coupled with abundant compassionate oversight."[5]

The noun *n^ešîyâ* occurs in Ps. 88:13(Eng. v. 12): God's wonders and righteousness are not known (*yd'* niphal) in the land of forgetfulness. The realm of the dead is the land of forgetfulness (cf. Lethe as the river in the netherworld of Greek mythology). Ps. 6:6(5) also says that there is neither remembrance nor praise of God in the realm of the dead. On the other hand, the dead there have been forgotten by the living (Eccl. 1:11; 2:10, *'ên zikkārôn*); cf. especially 9:5: The dead know *(yd')* nothing, "the memory of them *(ziḵrām)* has fallen into forgetfulness *(niškaḥ)*."

IV. LXX. The LXX generally translates with *epilanthánō.* In Job 39:17 *aposiōpáō* is used, and in Job 11:6 circumlocution is used. Ps. 88:13(12) is rendered by *en gę̄ epilelēsménę̄.*

Ringgren

---

5. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 169.

נָשַׁךְ *nāšaḵ;* נֶשֶׁךְ *nešeḵ*

Contents: I. General Considerations: 1. Occurrences in Other Languages; Etymology; 2. Meaning; 3. LXX. II. Usage: 1. To Bite; 2. To Charge Interest; 3. *nešeḵ.* III. Qumran.

---

nāšaḵ. M. Fraenkel, "Bemerkungen zum hebräischen Wortschatz," *HUCA* 31 (1960) 65ff.; H. Gamoran, "The Biblical Law Against Loans on Interest," *JNES* 30 (1971) 127-34; J. Hejcl, *Das alttestamentliche Zinsverbot. BSt* XII/4 (1907); E. Klingenberg, "Das israelitische Zinsverbot in Torah, Mišna und Talmud," *AAWLM.G* 7 (1977) 5-102, esp. 23; S. E. Loewenstamm, "מ/תרבית and נשך," *JBL* 88 (1969) 78-80; B. J. Meislin and M. L. Cohen, "Backgrounds of the Biblical Law Against Usury," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 6 (The Hague, 1964), 250-67, esp. 266; B. N. Nelson, *The Idea of Usury: From Tribal Brotherhood to Universal Otherhood* (Princeton, 1949); E. Neufeld, "The Rate of Interest and the Text of Nehemiah 5,11," *JQR* 44 (1953/54) 194-204; idem, "The Prohibitions Against Loans at Interest in Ancient Hebrew Laws," *HUCA* 26 (1955) 355-412; R. Salomon, *Le Prêt à intérêt en législation juive* (Paris, 1932); S. Stein, "The Laws on Interest in the OT," *JTS* 4 (1953) 161-70; E. Szlechter, "Le prêt dans l'AT et dans les Codes mésopotamiens d'avant Hammourabi," *RHPR* 35 (1955) 16-25; A. Weingort-Boczko, "L'Interdiction des intérêts en droit juif," *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 57 (1979) 235-45; idem, *Le Prêt à intérêt dans le droit talmudique* (Paris, 1979); R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* esp. 170f.; → נתן *nāṯan.*

I. General Considerations.

1. *Occurrences in Other Languages; Etymology.* The root *nšk* occurs in the Semitic languages usually with the meaning "to bite." The word occurs frequently in ancient Mesopotamian texts, e.g., *šumma awīlum kalbam našik,* "when a man holds a dog with his teeth" (medicinal text), *šumma šapassu elīta unaššak,* "when he bites his upper lip."[1] In Ugaritic the verb *nṯk* also means "to bite," e.g., *ynṯkn kbṯnm,* "they bit each other like serpents"; cf. *nṯk nḥš,* "bite of the serpent."[2] The noun *nṯk* seems to mean "levy, tax."[3] In Arabic the meaning of *naṯaka* has been generalized: "to destroy, break up," whereas Eth. *nasaka* has preserved more of the meaning "to bite," though also in figurative usage. In Aramaic and Syriac metathesis has perhaps occurred to *nkt,* "to bite," though it is more probable that Northwest Semitic appropriated the reference from Akk. *nks.*

Not much can be said concerning etymology. The roots *nšk/nṯk* seem to have meant "to bite, tear, tear apart, gnaw," from an extremely early period, something supported by the rich witnesses to this usage in Akkadian. One difficulty, however, does attach to the metathesis *nšk/nkš.* Koehler assumes that Hebrew actually had two roots *nšk*: one with the meaning mentioned above, and another derived from *nešeḵ,* "interest, increase."[4] He views the noun *nešeḵ* as a loanword from Akkadian, where it derived perhaps from Sumerian. It is questionable, however, whether this derivation is necessary at all. While Akk. *nikkassu,* "settlement (of accounts)," is indeed a loanword from Sumerian,[5] the noun *niksu* "that which is cut off," has been constructed from the root *nks,* "to cut off."

M. Fraenkel refers back to the older suggestion made by R. von Raumer, who finds behind *nšk* an Indo-Germanic root *tuk* (in the sense of "increase, propagation"), which also lies behind Gk. *tókos.*[6]

2. *Meaning.* The same development occurred in Hebrew. Here the root *nks* is not used, but rather the familiar *nšk,* so that the noun *nešeḵ* refers to "that which is bitten off." This is how charging interest was viewed: as an increase "bitten off" from the principal, i.e., an increase for the lender, "to bite" for the receiver. The popular perception of charging interest has always been as "biting," and this was also clearly the case in the ancient Near East. Thus biting *(nšk)* could naturally also come to mean "to charge interest," and the root occurs in the OT with both these meanings.

---

1. See, respectively, F. Köcher, *Die babylonisch-assyrische Medizin in Texten und Untersuchungen,* 6 vols. (Berlin, 1963-80), IV, 393, r. 5 (Old Babylonian); F. R. Kraus, "Babylonische Omina mit Ausdeutung der Begleiterscheinungen des Sprechens," *AfO* 11 (1936/37) 223, no. 52.

2. For the former see *KTU,* 1.6 VI, 19; for the latter, 1.100, 4, 10, 20f., 31, etc.

3. *KTU,* 4.225, 14, 16.

4. *KBL*², 639; cf. also *HAL,* II, 729.

5. *AHw,* II, 789.

6. Pp. 66f.

3. *LXX.* As one might expect, these two meanings have parted ways in the LXX and received different renderings. Biting is translated by *dáknein* (e.g., Gen. 49:17; Nu. 21:6), while references to charging interest are rendered with the noun *tókos,* "interest" (e.g., Ex. 22:24[Eng. v. 25]; Dt. 23:20[19]).

II. Usage.

1. *To Bite.* The root *nšk* is used with the meaning "to bite" as early as the oldest songs, often in connection with serpents, which in ancient Canaan posed a much greater threat than today. Gen. 49:17 compares Dan with a serpent, "which bites the horse's heels so that his rider falls backward." The bite of the serpent is also mentioned in Nu. 21:6-9, where Moses makes a bronze serpent in the wilderness and sets it on a pole, thereby saving the life of those who had been bitten. With few exceptions the reference is always to the bite of serpents, clearly indicating this was much feared (Eccl. 10:8,11; Jer. 8:17; Am. 5:19; 9:3). When one expressed a threat, one frequently used the image of the bite of the serpent. Prov. 23:32 compares the effects of wine with the bite of a serpent: "At the last it bites like a serpent, and stings like an adder."

Only once is *nšk* used to refer to the "bite of people." In an oracle against the prophets we read in Micah: "The prophets who lead my people astray and cry 'peace' when they have something to bite with their teeth" (Mic. 3:5), whereby *hannōšᵉk̲îm* seems to be used in a neutral sense here, though it is to be understood ironically.

2. *To Charge Interest.* The figurative meaning "to charge interest" is found in its verbal form only in Dt. 23:20f.(19f.) and Hab. 2:7. Koehler considers the root in these passages to be a denominative from *nešek̲,* though this is not necessary. Dt. 23:20f.(19f.) is the locus classicus concerning the question of charging interest in ancient Israel. Hab. 2:7 raises a cry of woe concerning those who enrich themselves with the property of others; yet even against such persons, the "biters" (*nōšᵉk̲eyk̲ā,* i.e., their debtors) will rise up. This play on words evokes both meanings of the root *nšk* and makes clear the conceptual connection between "biting" and "charging interest."[7]

Dt. 23:20f.(19f.) uses the verb *nšk* in the qal and hiphil as well as the noun *nešek̲:* "You shall not charge interest on loans to another Israelite, interest on money, interest on provisions, interest on anything that is lent. On loans to a foreigner you may charge interest, but on loans to another Israelite you may not charge interest, so that Yahweh your God may bless you in all your undertakings in the land that you are about to enter and possess." Lending without interest did occasionally appear in the ancient Near East, and both Dt. 23 and Lev. 25:35-37 presuppose that this was also the case in Israel.[8] What comes to expression here is a feeling of solidarity with those belonging to the same society, an echo of the older Bedouin and farmer community. Mutual aid was a normal occurrence, and the charging of interest in such cases was viewed as "biting."

---

7. Cf. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 339.

8. Cf. E. Lipiński, "*Nešek* and *tarbit* in the Light of Epigraphic Evidence," *OLP* 10 (1979) 133; → נתן *nāt̲an.*

Another consideration was that the interest rates were extraordinarily high, 20 to 50 percent not being unusual. Furthermore, there was a distinct difference in the actual practice of dealing with interest between the farmers and nomadic inhabitants on the one hand, and urban dwellers on the other, especially traders and merchants. Jews from the colony of Elephantine in Egypt appropriated the customs of the Egyptians and demanded interest and compound interest even from their own compatriots, though in this case the term *nšk* was not used, but rather *marbît̲,* which later became the term for interest.[9]

In the ancient Laws of Eshnunna one also encounters the charging of interest, here expressed by the noun *ṣibtum,*[10] while *našākum* means only "to bite" and is used parallel with *nakāsum,* "to sever."[11] In the world of ancient Babylon the charging of interest was a completely normal occurrence, something seen in the many regulations found in the Code of Hammurabi.[12] Babylonian merchants had no way of carrying on trade without investing their money against interest. That foreigners carried on trade in Israel emerges not least from Dt. 23:21(20), and Neh. 12 mentions merchants from Tyre. These people naturally demanded interest, just as interest was demanded of them (cf. Dt. 23:21[20]). The regulations in Dt. 23:21(20) (cf. Ex. 22:24[25] and Lev. 25:36) likely represent the last attempt to preserve older customs and practices from the tribal period in the hope that the older sense of solidarity would come to expression, a notion according quite well with the primary concerns of Deuteronomy.

3. *nešek̲.* Koehler defines the term *nešek̲* as an increase in the settlement of an account, and views it as a loanword from Akkadian. Although the connection with Babylonian merchants came about quite early and was certainly not unimportant, the Akkadian word is *nikkassu* (see discussion above). The word *nešek̲* occurs in the previously mentioned statement of Dt. 23:20(19) referring to interest on money, provisions, and all sorts of other things for which one charges interest. No kind of interest was permitted in connection with one's compatriots. This is also explicitly underscored in Ex. 22:24(25): "If you lend money to my people, to the poor among you, you shall not deal with them as a creditor; you shall not exact interest from them." Concerning this prescription M. Noth remarks: "So a rule of life is put forward and affirmed for Israel, who is and is to remain separate from the urban character of the settled lands of the ancient East with their life of business and trade."[13] Lev. 25:36-38 offers theological justification for such a prescription: "You shall fear your God, that your brother may live beside you." The admonitions in Lev. 25:36f. are clear: "Take no interest *(nešek̲)* from him or increase *(tarbît̲).* You shall not lend him your money *(kasp^{e}k̲ā)* at interest *(lō' tittēn lô b^{e}nešek̲).*" The significance of this commandment emerges from Ps. 15:5. In this psalm, which gives the rules for entering the holy precinct, the prohibition against

9. Cf. *AP,* 10:4, 6, 8, 11f., 14-16, 18; 11:8f.
10. §§18, 20f.; translation in *ANET,* 161-63.
11. §§42f., 56f.
12. CH, §§48-51, 89-96, 100; translation in *ANET,* 163-80.
13. *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 187.

charging interest fits quite naturally: "who does not put out his money at interest." This reflects the behavior of the person who walks blamelessly (Ps. 15:2). Prov. 28:8 explains what happens to the person who does not act thus: "He who augments his wealth by interest *(nešek)* and increase *(tarbîṯ)* gathers it for him who is kind to the poor."

In Ezekiel, too, it is characteristic of the righteous person not to lend at interest *(nešek)* or increase *(tarbîṯ)* (Ezk. 18:8,17). The person who does not act thus but rather does indeed charge interest and increase "shall surely die" (Ezk. 18:13). In his judgment on Jerusalem in ch. 22, the prophet again mentions the charging of interest and increase as one of the crude sins that will bring chastisement on the God-forsaken city (Ezk. 22:12ff.).

The prohibition against charging interest could not prevent lending against surety, something that in its own turn resulted in debt. Nehemiah thus considered it necessary in 445 to put through a remission of debts (Neh. 5:1-13).

III. Qumran. The root *nšk* is attested in 1QpHab in a citation from Hab. 2:7: *nōšᵉḵeyḵā*, "your biters," though the first part of the word is missing in the text of 1QpHab 8:14. The interpretation of the difficult passage is here applied to the priest who rebelled and violated the commandments (8:16f.).

Kapelrud

נְשָׁמָה *nᵉšāmâ*

Contents: I. Etymology; II. 1. Occurrences; 2. Syntax; 3. LXX. III. 1. God's *nᵉšāmâ* as Life-Giving Breath; 2. *nᵉšāmâ* as "Life" in General; 3. "Living Creatures"; 4. God's *nᵉšāmâ* as Destructive Power. IV. Job. V. Qumran.

I. Etymology. The word *nᵉšāmâ* is a feminine form of the *qaṭalat* pattern of *nšm*.[1] It is attested beyond Biblical Hebrew also in Middle Hebrew, Palmyrene, Biblical Aramaic, Samaritan, and Christian Palestinian Aramaic as *nišmā'*, and additionally also in Jewish Aramaic as *nišmᵉṯā'*, in Syriac as *nᵉšamtā'*, in Mandaic as *nišimta*, and in Arabic as *nasamat*.[2] The only verbal form, *'eššōm*, occurs in Isa. 42:14 with the mean-

---

nᵉšāmâ. A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, ²1964), 27f.; T. C. Mitchell, "The OT Usage of nᵉšāmā," *VT* 11 (1961) 177-87; H. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1966), 121f.; J. Scharbert, *Fleisch, Geist und Seele im Pentateuch. SBS* 19 (²1967), 22; O. Schilling, *Geist und Materie in biblischer Sicht. SBS* 25 (1967), 42, 45; F. J. Stendebach, *Theologische Anthropologie des Jahwisten* (Bonn, 1970); T. C. Vriezen, *An Outline of OT Theology* (Eng. trans., Wageningen, ²1970); H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1974), esp. 59f.

1. See *BLe*, 463t; *HAL*, II, 730.

2. For Palmyrene see *DNSI*, II, 765; for Mandaic, *MdD*, 300a; for Arabic, Wehr (⁴1979), 1130.

ing "to pant, breathe heavily" (Yahweh pants like a woman in travail). The emendation suggested by *BHS* for Dt. 33:21, from *šām* ("there") to *yiššōm* (here in the sense of "to yearn for"), seems to make little sense given the context, and thus seems without justification.

The basic meaning is "breath, wind," also "breath of life, living creature." The word → רוח *rûaḥ* appears as its parallel (cf. Eccl. 12:7 and elsewhere).

II. 1. *Occurrences.* The subst. n^e*šāmâ* occurs 24 times in the Hebrew OT, and once each in the Aramaic part of Daniel (5:23) and in Sirach (9:13). Of these occurrences, 3 are found in the Pentateuch, 6 in the Deuteronomistic history, 4 in Isaiah (though nowhere else among the prophetic writings), and 11 times in wisdom literature (7 times in Job).

2. *Syntax.* The term n^e*šāmâ* appears in several different syntactical combinations. In the singular absolute state it occurs 10 times without the article, twice with the article. The following construct combinations occur: *nišmaṯ rûaḥ ('ap),* "blast of his wrathful breath" (2 S. 22:16 par. Ps. 18:16[Eng. v. 15]); *nišmaṯ ḥayyîm,* "breath of life" (Gen. 2:7; 7:22); *nišmaṯ* '^{e}*lôah,* "breath of God" (Job 4:9); *nišmaṯ 'ēl,* "breath of God" (Job 37:10); *nišmaṯ YHWH,* "breath of Yahweh" (Isa. 30:33); *nišmaṯ šadday,* "breath of the Almighty" (Job 32:8; 33:4); *nišmaṯ 'āḏām,* "breath [RSV 'spirit'] of man" (Prov. 20:27). A suffix is twice used with n^e*šāmâ* (Job 27:3, *nišmāṯî;*[3] 34:14, *nišmāṯô*).

3. *LXX.* The LXX renders n^e*šāmâ* 13 times with *pnoḗ,* 4 times with *empneín,* 3 times with *pneúma,* and once each with *próstagma, émpneusis, thymós,* and *zōḗ.* In Dnl. 10:17 the LXX has *pneúma,* Theodotion *pnoḗ;* Isa. 2:22 has *anapnoḗ* (though this verse is not found in most mss.).

III. 1. *God's* n^e*šāmâ as Life-Giving Breath.* The point of departure for understanding n^e*šāmâ* in the OT is the oldest witness, Gen. 2:7. Here the Yahwist conceives the creation of human beings as a twofold process: God forms the human being from the dust of the ground and then breathes into him the "breath of life" *(nišmaṯ ḥayyîm).* Though n^e*šāmâ* here already means "breath of life, breath," in and of itself, its combination with *ḥayyîm* underscores further its character as "life-giving" breath.[4] The second act is the decisive one, since only through Yahweh's n^e*šāmâ* does the human being become a living being, does "something quickened into life" emerge from "just something."[5]

The notion of the quickening to life of this human being of clay, however, was not new with J; it is found earlier in Egyptian portrayals in which the goddess Hathor holds the symbol of life (ankh, Egyp. *'nḫ*) up to the mouth and nose of the form created by

3. Cf. IV below.
4. → חיה *ḥāyâ (chāyāh)* (IV, 324-44).
5. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1984), 206.

Khnum. "This is clearly a very abstract adaptation of the older form where the creator breathes the breath of life into what he has shaped. This older form appears in the primitive descriptions, as well as in the account of a Babylonian story of the creation given in Berossos . . . and in Gen 2:7."[6] J thus appropriates here a notion already predominant many centuries before him, one more specifically identifying human beings.

After shaping this lifeless, material form from the dust of the *'^{a}ḏāmâ,* Yahweh turns it into the *nepeš ḥayyâ* by means of his own *n^{e}šāmâ.*[7] It is thus in the *n^{e}šāmâ* that J views the power that actually brings life to the human being. This *n^{e}šāmâ,* as ensoulment through in-spiration, is something different from the incorporeal being called the "soul," which completes the body in its identity as a living human being, bestowing both life and consciousness upon a person and, as spirit, enduring beyond death.[8] Antiquity perceives human beings only in their capacity as living beings (to be understood as a whole) or as dead.[9]

Without *n^{e}šāmâ,* then, the human being is dead, and the *n^{e}šāmâ* as the characteristic feature of life reveals human beings bound together inseparably with Yahweh,[10] though this inspiration of the divine breath does not constitute for human beings the reception of a divine soul or a divine spirit, and in this the human being, despite the breath of life received from God, is indeed different from the Creator.[11] That is, *n^{e}šāmâ* means "the giving of life to humans, nothing more."[12] Nor does this reception of the *n^{e}šāmâ* account for any fundamental difference between human beings and the animal world, since 7:22 (J) mentions the *nišmaṯ rûaḥ ḥayyîm* as the life-giving principle in reference to animals as well.[13] The word *rûaḥ* constitutes a later insertion by P, since the term does not occur in the expression *nišmaṯ ḥayyîm* in 2:7 (J), but does occur in the expression *rûaḥ ḥayyîm* (7:15, P). Since 7:22 clearly belongs to J, *rûaḥ* represents a subsequent addition whose reason is no longer discernible.[14]

This understanding of the *n^{e}šāmâ* occurs in Isa. 42:5 and 57:16 as an unequivocal evocation of the creation events. According to 42:5 Yahweh "created the earth and what comes from it, he gives breath *(n^{e}šāmâ)* to the people upon it and spirit to those who walk in it"; a promise to believers assures them that "their *rûaḥ* shall not pass away before me, nor their *n^{e}šāmâ,* which I made" (57:16). The parallel of *n^{e}šāmâ* and *rûaḥ* reveals the semantic relationship between the two terms; God gives both to human beings as life-giving powers. In this form, such parallel usage is found otherwise only in Job 4:9; 27:3; 32:8; 33:4; 34:14.[15]

The term *n^{e}šāmâ* acquires a negative sense in Isa. 2:22, which inquires concerning

---

6. Ibid., 205.
7. → נפשׁ *nepeš;* cf. Wolff, 33.
8. Cf. Stendebach, 249.
9. Cf. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 207.
10. Cf. Wolff, 59.
11. Cf. Vriezen, 406.
12. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 207.
13. Stendebach, 249; contra Scharbert, 22; and Mitchell, 181.
14. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11,* 439f.; cf. Stendebach, ch. 6, 112 n. 12.
15. See IV below.

the significance of human beings as such, in whose nostrils there is "merely *n^ešāmâ*." This use of *n^ešāmâ* is unusual, since in contrast to Gen. 2:7 it is not viewed as a divine gift, serving rather as a negative characteristic of human beings. In this difficult passage, which is to be viewed as a gloss to Isa. 2:6-21, *n^ešāmâ* should probably be understood in the sense of → הבל *heḇel* (Job 7:16) or → עפר *'āpār* (Ps. 103:14).[16] In my opinion, this change in the understanding of *n^ešāmâ* derives from the fact that "in view of the imminent Day of Yahweh it would be vital to trust neither in idols nor in man, but to rely only on God and in that way to avoid judgment."[17] That is, the *n^ešāmâ* characterizes human beings in their capacity as mortal beings; as already mentioned, Yahweh's own *n^ešāmâ* does not elevate them into a divine sphere.

2. *n^ešāmâ as "Life" in General.* From the perspective of creation, *n^ešāmâ* characterizes a person's physical life. Daniel's encounter with the supernatural world stunned him to such an extent that his strength was drained and his breath *(n^ešāmâ)* faltered (Dnl. 10:17). The author of the book of Sirach advises to stay away from the person who has the power to kill, "lest he rob you of your life *(nišmāṯ^eḵā)*" (Sir. 9:13). When 1 K. 17:17 says that the son of the widow of Zarephath had become so ill that "no *n^ešāmâ* was left in him," this means that death had come (cf. vv. 18ff.).

3. *"Living Creatures."* Based on the notion that *n^ešāmâ* in the full sense constitutes life, the term came to be used in the general sense of "living creature." The war laws in Deuteronomy direct Israel to leave no *n^ešāmâ* alive in the cities that Yahweh gives them as their inheritance[18] (Dt. 20:16). This directive is implemented during the conquest of the promised land, during which Israel on the one hand carries out the ban "on all that breathed" (*kol-hann^ešāmâ,* Josh. 10:40), and on the other so devastates the Canaanite cities that "there was none left that breathed *(kol-n^ešāmâ)*" (11:11,14).[19] As soon as Baasha became king, he killed all the house of Jeroboam and destroyed everything that had *n^ešāmâ* (1 K. 15:29).

Given this understanding of *n^ešāmâ*, Prov. 20:27 presents problems: "The human *n^ešāmâ* is the lamp of Yahweh, searching all the innermost parts." According to this passage, the breath of life that has been breathed into a person is a "lamp" for Yahweh revealing to Yahweh even a person's innermost secrets that are unknown to that person.[20] Considering Prov. 24:12 and Job 7:20, the reading suggested by *BHS, nōṣēr YHWH nišmaṯ 'āḏām,* seems more appropriate; here the masc. sg. ptcp. *ḥōpēś* finds in Yahweh a grammatically unobjectionable correlative. One should probably proceed on the assumption[21] that this passage is to be read: "Yahweh 'guards, watches over' the

---

16. So H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 121f.: "breath, vapor, vanity."
17. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1983), 63.
18. → נחל *nāḥal* (IX, 319-35).
19. → חרם *ḥrm* II, V, 195-98.
20. Cf. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 239; see also → נר *nēr,* II.3.
21. Cf. Wolff, 59-60, 236 n. 5, contra Plöger, *Sprüche,* 239.

human breath, he searches all the innermost parts." In this sense Yahweh is not only the creator but also the protector of one's breath. The function of the *n^e šāmâ* and thus also the task of human beings is ultimately praise of God (Ps. 150:6).

4. *God's n^e šāmâ as Destructive Power.* Yahweh's *n^e šāmâ* not only exhibits a positive, creative power but also causes the earth's foundations to quake. In Ps. 18:16(15) par. 2 S. 22:16 the *nišmaṯ rûaḥ* of Yahweh's wrath (par. *ga'ar,* "rebuke") is described as a power rendering the depths of the sea visible, and laying bare the foundations of the world *(tēḇēl).* This conception, within a theophany portrayal, presents Yahweh as ruler and conqueror of the powers of chaos. The use of *n^e šāmâ* here is quite different from that in Gen. 2:7. It is difficult to date this psalm;[22] if it is taken as a unity, it was probably composed in the preexilic period.[23] Since form-critical and stylistic considerations suggest a later stage, it is probably to be dated during the postexilic period;[24] in any event, the motif of the chaos struggle derives as a rule from the exilic or postexilic period (cf. Deutero-Isaiah).

The notion of the life-giving power of the *nišmaṯ YHWH* is left behind in the authentic text of Isa. 30:33: it ignites the wood for a sacrifice.

IV. Job. The book of Job attests the entire semantic scope of *n^e šāmâ;* all the passages come from the later poetry of Job (3:1–42:6). In Job 33:4 Elihu confesses that he is God's creature, created by God's *rûaḥ* and given life through his *n^e šāmâ.* Together these two constitute the "guarantee of Elihu's genuine or sinless knowledge and words."[25] Job 27:3 presents Job's *n^e šāmâ* and the *rûaḥ 'elōah* as guarantors of Job's truthfulness. Even though this parallelism does not specify the relationship between the two more closely, it is not necessary to read the 1st sg. suffix of *nišmaṯî* as the 3rd sg. *y* of the Phoenician form, since in all other occurrences of *n^e šāmâ* as a parallel to *rûaḥ* in the book of Job the reference is to God's *n^e šāmâ.*[26] Job 34:14 underscores that both existence and the duration of life depend on God's vivifying *n^e šāmâ* alone. It also bestows wisdom (32:8); otherwise Job's question in 26:4 ("with whose help have you uttered words, and whose *n^e šāmâ* has come forth from you?") would be incomprehensible. The destructive power of God's *n^e šāmâ,* of the kind already described above, appears in the first discourse of Eliphaz (4:8f.): Those who sow trouble perish by God's *n^e šāmâ.* As lord over the powers of nature, his breath causes ice to form that covers over broad expanses of water (37:10).

---

22. Cf. the enumeration of possibilities in H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 258.

23. Cf. J. Jeremias, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung. WMANT* 10 (1965), 33f.

24. Cf. A. Deissler, *Die Psalmen. Welt der Bibel: Kleinkommentare zur Heiligen Schrift* (Düsseldorf, 1963), 77.

25. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 456.

26. Cf. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 339.

V. Qumran. In Qumran literature *n^e^šāmâ* occurs only twice. 11QPs^a^ 19:4 *(nišmaṯ kol bāśār)* mentions Yahweh as the creator of all that lives (cf. Gen. 2:7). The Community Rule (1QS 5:17) cites Isa. 2:22, thereby giving *n^e^šāmâ* a negative connotation.

Lamberty-Zielinski

נֶשֶׁף *nešep*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology, Occurrences; 2. Versions. II. 1. Semantics in Context; 2. Theological Contexts.

I. 1. *Etymology, Occurrences.* This word is generally derived from the root *nšp,* "to blow," which occurs in other Semitic languages with similar meaning (Akk. *našāpu;* Aram. *nšp*)[1] and is related phonetically with the roots *nšb, nšm,* and *npš* ("to blow, breathe heavily, breathe," etc.). Derivation from the homonymous Middle Hebrew root *nšp* ("to jump up, separate, loosen by pressing")[2] seems misdirected. Since the verbal form of *nšp* refers to the blowing of the wind (Ex. 15:10; Isa. 40:24), while the noun *nešep* obviously refers to a time of day, this word can be understood originally as a reference to those hours when in Israel a cool wind usually comes up: shortly before the rising and after the setting of the sun (cf. Gen. 3:8; Cant. 2:17).[3] Thus *nešep* refers to the darkness both of morning and of evening. This double sense was recognized as early as the Talmud and given a popular-etymological explanation ("the night withdraws, *nšp,* then day comes; the day withdraws, *nšp,* and night comes," Bab. *Ber.* 3b); commenting on Job 3:9, Ibn Ezra defines *nešep* as both the beginning and the end of the night. This ultimately yields the comprehensive meaning "darkness."

The term *nešep* occurs 12 times in the OT, all but two in poetic speech. It appears only in the singular, is used in genitive combinations (as *nomen regens* in Isa. 21:4, and as *rectum* in Jer. 13:16 and Job 3:9), and in one instance is used with a possessive suffix (Job 3:9).

2. *Versions.* The ancient versions reflect the word's semantic scope by rendering largely with general expressions for "darkness" (LXX *skótos,* Vulg. *tenebrae,* Targ.

---

nešep. A. Baumstark, *Nocturna laus. Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen* 32 (Münster/Aschendorff, 1957); K. Goldammer, *Die Formenwelt des Religiösen. Kröners Taschenausgabe* 264 (Stuttgart, 1960), 59, 210ff., 297ff.; → בקר *bōqer,* II, 228; → חשך *ḥāšak* (V, 245-59); לילה/ליל *layil/laylâ* (VII, 533-42); ערב *'ereḇ.*

1. For Akkadian see *AHw,* II, 758; *CAD,* XI/2, 56. For Aramaic see Jastrow, 941; F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (Berolini, 1903), 129; Beyer, 642; on Arab. *nsf* see *GesB,* 527; *KBL*[2], 640 (no longer in *HAL,* II, 730).

2. See Rashi on Bab. *Ber.* 3b and *Meg.* 3a; Levy, *WTM,* III, 452f.

3. O. Keel, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel* (Zurich/Cologne/Göttingen, 1984), I, 51f.

qbl', Luther and Buber-Rosenzweig,[4] *Dämmerung* [twilight, dusk, dawn]). Translations occasionally feel obliged to be semantically more specific, though in these cases each bases the rendering on its own interpretation. Thus *nešep* is interpreted as "dawn": LXX *heōsphóros* (1 S. 30:17); Luther *früe* (2 K 7:5,7 [RSV "twilight"]; Ps. 119:147 [RSV "dawn"]); Targ. *šprpr'* (Ps. 119:147; Job 7:4); Syr. *ṣpr'* (2 K. 7:5); in contrast, it is also interpreted as "evening twilight": LXX *opsé* (Isa. 5:11); Vulg. *vesper* (Isa. 5:11; 1 S. 30:17; 2 K. 7:5), Targ. *rmš'* (Prov. 7:9); and finally also as "(mid-) night": LXX *mesonýktios* (Isa. 59:10), *nýx* (Job 3:9), Targ. *nšp lyly'* (Job 24:15).

II. 1. *Semantics in Context.* That the word can refer to the early morning hours is revealed by Job 7:4, where the suffering Job laments: "When I lie down . . . I am full of tossing till the *nešep*," i.e., until the morning dawns (so Targ. and Rashi: *nešep šel yôm*).

The LXX renders "from evenings till early in the morning" *(apó hespéras héōs prōí)* for *nešep*, as if the ambiguity of the Hebrew word was to be maintained; but the Greek version is based on a variant reading or understanding according to which the person thus languishing away yearns during the evening for morning, and during the morning for evening.

Usually, however, the word refers to the "later evening hours." Isa. 5:11 portrays the excessive revelers who in their desire for intoxicating drink rise early in the morning *(bōqer)* and then tarry late into the *nešep* with their wine. Though one might think here of a period well advanced into the evening (LXX, Ibn Ezra), the reference may even be to the very late night or wee hours (Targ., Rashi, Luther: "into the night"), since elsewhere *nešep* on the one hand is juxtaposed in direct contrast to *ṣohorayim*, "midday" (Isa. 59:10), and on the other hand stands in a contiguous relationship with expressions for "dark" and "darkness" (Jer. 13:16). This provides a semantic profile for the word: *nešep* refers to the darkness characterizing the earliest and latest hours, whereby this darkness is not only confirmed as such but is also described as an interim condition; it refers to the darkness that has just come about or is just waning.

This can be seen in those prose passages in which the use of this rare word can only be explained on the basis of this specific meaning. In the story of 2 K. 7:5ff. the lepers wait for the *nešep* to carry out the plan they made during the course of the day, namely, to go over to the enemy camp; in the evening darkness they can no longer be seen and seized by their own people (cf. vv. 9,12; contra Syr., Luther, "in the early morning"; cf. RSV "they arose at twilight"). Under the cover of precisely this emerging darkness (*nešep*, v. 7), however, the enemy had already taken flight. A determination of the precise time of day is more difficult in 1 S. 30:17, which asserts that David smote the Amalekites "from *nešep* until the evening *('ereb)*." The answer to the question whether this battle lasted from dawn until evening (so Bab. *Ber.* 3b, LXX, Syr., Luther), or from one evening to the next (Jewish exegetes such as Pesiqta de Rab Kahana, J. Karo, Tanḥum, Kimchi), depends on a text-critical decision.[5] The present Hebrew text

4. Buber-Rosenzweig, in loc.
5. See *BHK.*

(emended *l^e moh^o rāṯô*) states that after darkness came David attacked them as they celebrated their spoils, and pursued and annihilated them until the next evening (RSV "until the evening of the next day"). The dynamic sense of the word is also intended in the sequence "mountains of *nešep*" (Jer. 13:16): these are not mountains lying in darkness[6] but rather mountains upon which darkness begins to descend (cf. the context: "before he brings darkness, before your feet stumble"). The "stars of *nešep*" (Job 3:9) might be referring to Mercury and Venus, which give off light in the morning or evening twilight, which renders unnecessary any choice between "evening twilight" (LXX) and "morning twilight (dawn)."[7] Nonetheless, the context suggests the latter alternative: the cursing of the day of birth and its night consists in losing the stars that presage morning. The "*nešep* I longed for" (Isa. 21:4) is the evening coolness so welcome in the Near East, though in this case it brings terror and fear.

2. *Theological Contexts.* The darkening *nešep* opens the door to sinful activity. The adulterer lies in wait for the *nešep* (Job 24:15), which cloaks his face so that no eye can see him. At *nešep* (Prov. 7:9), at the end of the day and under the cover of darkness, the adulterous woman lies in wait to seduce the unwary young man (vv. 6-21). A person's iniquity and transgression cast themselves over him like heavy darkness (Isa. 59:9-15), so that he stumbles in the light of midday as if it were *nešep* (v. 10). In contrast to other elements attaching to the conceptual field "darkness," this word by no means symbolizes the sphere of evil which is completely cut off from God. At the hour of twilight and uncertainty a person can approach closer to God: Just as believers begin even before the night watch to meditate on Yahweh's words, so also do they eagerly rise before the *nešep* (Ps. 119:147) that they might raise their voices in prayer to Yahweh.

Kedar-Kopfstein

---

6. *KBL*[2], 640.

7. For the former see E. König, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1910; [6,7]1937), 291. For the latter see *GesB,* 527; B. Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob. KHC* XVI (1897), 20; S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Comm. on the Book of Job. ICC,* 2 vols. (1921), I, 34f.

נָשַׁק *nāšaq;* נְשִׁיקָה *n^e šîqâ*

Contents: I. Distribution, Meaning, Etymology. II. OT Usage: 1. Occurrences; 2. Expression of Human Relationships; 3. Expression of Veneration. III. Figurative Usage.

I. Distribution, Meaning, Etymology. The root *nšq* is attested in most of the ancient Semitic languages (Akkadian, Ugaritic, Hebrew), and was also used in Qumran and in Jewish Aramaic in the sense of the Biblical Hebrew tradition. The Old Aramaic witnesses are not undisputed, and are partially replaced by conjectures.[1] Egyptian attests a phonetically different but semantically equivalent word *(śn)*.[2]

The focus of the semantic field of *nšq* is the notion of kissing with its various meanings: as a constituent part of intensive love relationships, as an expression of bonds of kinship, and as a sign of submissive veneration.[3] The religious sphere is also included. Thus in the Aqhat epic the Ugaritic hero Danel kisses the grain in order to release it from the power of the drought.[4] This variety of meanings associated with *nšq* is also found in the OT witnesses.[5]

The etymology of the root *nšq* is unclear. J. Barth derives it from Arabic in the meaning "to smell something; to sip breath."[6] Both *GesB* and *HAL* list in addition to the root *nšq* I, "to kiss," an additional, homonymous root, *nšq* II, with the meaning "to equip oneself" or "to arm oneself," which is traced back to Arab. *nasaqa,* "to line up, put in an order," and which is also alleged in Ezk. 3:13.[7] L. Kopf correctly points out that the etymological connection between *nšq* I and *nšq* II needs more precise investigation. More recently, J. M. Cohen has returned to Arab. *nasaqa,* "to line up, put in an order," advancing for *nšq* I the basic meaning "to seal (the lips [in silence])."[8] With this interpretation, one supported only by the Talmud, he can also make sense of disputed

---

nāšaq. N. Adcock, "Genesis 41:40," *ExpT* 67 (1955/56) 383; J. Barth, *Etymologische Studien zum Semitischen* (Leipzig, 1893); A. Bertholet, "Eine crux interpretum. Ps 2,11f.," *ZAW* 28 (1908) 58; idem, "Nochmals zu Ps 2:11f.," *ZAW* 28 (1908) 193; W. H. Brownlee, "Psalm 1–2 as a Coronation Liturgy," *Bibl* 52 (1971) 321-36; J. M. Cohen, "An Unrecognized Connotation of *nšq peh* with Special Reference to Three Biblical Occurrences," *VT* 32 (1982) 416-24; G. R. Driver, "Difficult Words in the Hebrew Prophets," *Studies in OT Prophecy. FS T. H. Robinson* (Edinburgh, 1950), 52-72, esp. 55f.; W. L. Holladay, "A New Proposal for the Crux in Ps II 12," *VT* 28 (1978) 110-12; K. A. Kitchen, "The Term *Nšq* in Gen 41:40," *ExpT* 69 (1957/58) 30; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 9 (1957) 247-87, esp. 265-67; A. A. Macintosh, "A Consideration of the Problems Presented by Psalm II 11 and 12," *JTS* 27 (1976) 1-14; A. Robinson, "Deliberate but Misguided Haplography Explains Psalm 2,11-12," *ZAW* 89 (1977) 421-22; W. Thiel, "Der Weltherrschaftsanspruch des judäischen Königs nach Psalm 2," *ThV* 3 (1971) 53-63; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1974), 169-73.

1. Ahiqar 103, 222; H. L. Ginsberg, *ANET,* 426-28; cf. *DNSI,* II, 764f.; *AP,* 237f., 248; J. N. Epstein, "Glossen zu den 'aramäischen Papyrus und Ostraka,'" *ZAW* 32 (1912) 135.

2. Cf. *WbÄS,* IV, 153f.

3. For the first, in Ugaritic, see *KTU,* 1.23, 49, 51, 55; 1.17 I, 39. For the second see Gilg. XII, 24, 26; in *KTU,* 1.22 I 4 "the little one whom the lips kiss" refers to the beloved grandchild. For the third see Esarhaddon, Prism B I, 84-85.

4. *KTU,* 1.19 II, 15, 22; *ANET,* 153.

5. See II.2, 3 below.

6. Pp. 46f.

7. *HAL,* II, 730f.

8. Cohen, 416f. This view is mentioned in *KBL*², 640, though associated in *HAL,* II, 731, with *nšq* II.

passages (e.g., Gen. 41:40; Job 31:27; Prov. 24:26; see below). W. von Soden explains *nāšaq* as onomatopoeic: to make *šiq*.[9]

II. OT Usage.

1. *Occurrences.* The root *nšq* occurs 32 times in the OT. The verb occurs in the following aspects with these meanings: qal, "to kiss; touch one another"; piel, "to kiss long and much"; hiphil, "to touch one another" (perhaps add "audibly").[10] The noun *n^e^šîqâ* occurs twice. The root *nšq* occurs only once in the writings of Qumran, in an expression appropriated from the OT (CD 13:3; cf. Gen. 41:40).[11]

2. *Expression of Human Relationships.*

a. *Love.* The OT rarely mentions kissing as a sign of a love relationship between man and woman; in the positive sense this occurs only in Cant. 1:2; 8:1, while Prov. 7:13 reckons the kiss among the devices of seduction employed by the adulterous woman.

The remarks on Gen. 29:11 ("then Jacob kissed Rachel") passed down in the rabbinic commentaries make clear just how this reserved attitude emerged concerning the encounter between man and woman and thus why the OT so rarely mentions kissing in this sense: "In general, kissing serves immorality, though three kinds are exceptions, namely, kissing accompanying the acquisition of honor (1 S. 10:1), kissing at the occasion of a reunion following a long absence (Ex. 4:27), and kissing at the occasion of departure (Ruth 1:14). R. Tanḥuma said: Kissing one's kin can also be added" (*Gen. Rab.* 70.12).[12] This witness to a rigoristic, religiously motivated attitude is complemented by the fact that at this time the acceptance of Canticles into the canon of OT writings was being hotly disputed.[13] In the meantime, one can assume that in daily life and in Israel's popular literature outside the OT itself, literature not preserved, both the word and the deed were more common than the tradition of the OT would lead one to believe.

b. *Kinship.* Kissing as a sign of bonds of kinship takes up considerable space, such bonds being especially underscored when taking leave or seeing one another again. After Jacob's dispute with Laban and his secret flight, Laban objects that he was not even able to kiss his daughters Rachel and Leah farewell (Gen. 31:28; cf. 32:1[Eng. 31:55]). At his calling by Elijah, Elisha asks that he be permitted to say farewell to his parents with a kiss (1 K. 19:20). In contrast, Naomi releases her two daughters-in-law with a kiss (Ruth 1:9; cf. 1:14). A farewell of a special sort is involved when blessings are bestowed in the case of imminent death (Gen. 27:26f.; 48:10; cf. 50:1: Joseph kisses his dead father Jacob). The occasion of reunion, usually after a longer separation, is also a situation at which one exchanges kisses (33:4: Jacob and Esau; 45:15: Joseph and his brothers; Ex. 4:27: Moses and his brother Aaron; Ex. 18:7: Moses and his father-in-law

9. "*n* als Wurzelaugment im Semitischen," *Bibel und Alter Orient. BZAW* 162 (1985), 110.
10. On the hiphil see II.1 below. On Gen. 41:40 see II.3.a below; on Ps. 2:12 see II.3.a below.
11. See II.3.a. below.
12. Cited by Levy, *WTM*, III², 453.
13. O. Eissfeldt, *The OT: An Intro.* (Eng. trans., New York, 1965), 485, 568.

Jethro; 2 S. 14:33b: David and his son Absalom after the latter's flight and exile). In contrast, Rachel and Laban have never seen Jacob before their mutual greeting (Gen. 29:11,13), and now attest their bonds of kinship with a kiss.

c. *Friendship.* The farewell kiss between David and Jonathan is a testimony to genuine friendship (1 S. 20:41); King David departs with a kiss from his aged benefactor Barzillai, who had supplied David with all the necessary provisions during David's flight from Absalom (2 S. 19:40). In contrast, the kiss with which the rebellious royal son Absalom greets the supplicants who come to the king (15:5) is politically motivated. The kiss that the commander Joab, who has been released from service, gives in greeting to his young successor Amasa (20:9; cf. 19:14[13]) is pure deception, and has been justifiably called the "OT kiss of Judas."[14]

3. *Expression of Veneration.*

a. *Secular.* The kiss belongs not only to the sphere of personal relationships such as those represented by love, friendship, or kinship, but it also becomes a symbol of veneration both in the secular-political and in the cultic sphere, though in some instances the boundary between the two cannot be sharply drawn. Thus 1 S. 10:1 recounts that as Yahweh's representative Samuel anoints Saul and greets him with a kiss as the king of Israel. Both K. Budde and H. W. Hertzberg remark that a bit of "fatherly affection" accompanies this kiss.[15]

The expression *wᵉʿal pîḵā yiššaq kol-ʿammî* in Gen. 41:10 (cited in CD 13:3) is unclear. The LXX, however, interprets it according to the context in the sense of *hypakoúsetai* (similarly the interpretation of CD 13:3 by 1QS 6:3-5).[16] There is no need to assume the presence of textual corruption or to replace the verb by *qšb* hiphil, "to be attentive."[17] Rather, this expression derives from the root *nšq* II, which can mean not only "to arm oneself" but also "to put oneself in an order, accommodate oneself." L. Kopf renders Gen. 41:40 as follows: "and all my people shall order themselves as you command" (so also RSV); J. M. Cohen interprets similarly, reckoning the meaning "to obey" (lit. "seal the lips") to *nšq* I (see discussion above).[18]

Ps. 2:11f. is justifiably considered a *crux interpretum.* The word *bar* (= Aramaic "son") is universally viewed as an error, making textual emendation unavoidable.[19] A. Bertholet's conjecture, *wᵉnaššᵉqû bᵉraglāyw birʿāḏâ* or *birʿāḏâ naššᵉqû bᵉraglāyw,* is supported by the psalm's general focus, by witnesses from the ancient Near East,[20] and by Jer. 49:23. Many exegetes follow this suggestion, with W. Thiel calling this

---

14. K. Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel. KHC* VIII (1902), 300.

15. K. Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel,* in loc.; H. W. Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher. ATD* 10 (⁶1982), in loc.

16. According to E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, ²1971), 290 n. 84.

17. For the former see C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1986), 94. For the latter see *KBL*², 640.

18. Kopf, 267; cf. also *HAL,* II, 731, in this context; Cohen, 417-20.

19. See Wagner, 37. Cf. *BHS.*

20. Esarhaddon, Prism B I, 84-85.

"one of the most fortunate and insightful conjectures."[21] In contrast, attempts following M. Dahood's suggestion to interpret the expression *nšq bar* according to Ugaritic as *nš qbr,* "men of the grave" = "mortals," are not so persuasive.[22] G. R. Driver expands *bar* to *gibbôr* and identifies it as a messianic royal title (cf. Isa. 9:5[6]). In contrast, A. A. Macintosh interprets the verb *nšq* here as in Gen. 41:40, approximating thus most closely the statement implied in Bertholet's conjecture.

b. *Religious.* According to the OT, the kiss as a symbol of veneration or respect also plays a role in the worship of the gods. In 1 K. 19:18 this gesture involves the Canaanite god Ba'al, according to Hos. 13:2 worshiped probably in the image of a calf.[23] The expression *wattiššaq yāḏî lᵉpî* (Job 31:27) indicates that this gesture could also be carried out as a "hand kiss."[24] Cohen translates: "If my hand ever sealed my mouth," referring to a gesture of silence in the context of religious worship.[25]

III. Figurative Usage. In the figurative sense *nšq* is used in the OT on two different levels: in the metaphorical speech of wisdom literature (Prov. 24:26; 27:6), and as a synonymous expression for personal encounter.

In Prov. 24:26 the kiss becomes a symbol of gladness ("He who gives a right answer kisses the lips like a friend."[26] In contrast, Prov. 27:6 evokes the notion of the "kiss of Judas"; *na'tārôṯ* is to be replaced by the niphal ptcp. *nᵉrā'ôṯ,* "to be evil," or *nᵉ'ôṯôṯ* (from *'wt*), "to be crooked, deceptive," so that the translation would be: "but the kisses of the enemy are deceptive."[27] Cohen again offers a different interpretation: "He that gives forthright judgement will silence all hostile lips."[28]

The description of the call vision of the prophet Ezekiel recounts that the wings of the creatures surrounding the throne-chariot touched one another with a certain noise (Ezk. 3:13: *nšq* hiphil). This can be understood as the figurative meaning of the term "to kiss," since at least externally a similar process is involved; it is also possible, however, to understand this form of *nšq* II in the sense of "to touch one another."[29]

For Ps. 85:11(10) the emendation of the qal form *nāšāqû* to the niphal *niššāqû* has been suggested.[30] The verb then parallels *pgš* niphal as an expression of amicable encounter.

Beyse

---

21. Thiel, 62f. n. 40. Cf. the comms. in loc.: H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968); F. Nötscher, *Das Buch der Psalmen. EB* IV (1962); H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987).

22. *Psalms 1–50. AB* 16 (1965), 13f.

23. → עגל *'ēgel.*

24. *GesB,* 527; *HAL,* II, 731; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), in loc.

25. Pp. 423f.

26. Translation according to B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos. HAT* I/16 (²1963), 88f.

27. Translation according to Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos,* 96. See discussion of 2 S. 20:9 in II.2 above; → רעע *r''*; cf. *HAL,* II, 804, conj.

28. Pp. 420-23.

29. So *HAL,* II, 731; see II.3.a above on Gen. 41:40.

30. *HAL,* II, 731; so also as early as Gunkel's comm.

נֶשֶׁר *nešer*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology and Semitic Isoglosses. II. OT Occurrences: 1. Overview; 2. Zoological Considerations. III. OT Usage: 1. The Prophets; 2. Pentateuch; 3. In Proverbial Wisdom; 4. Daniel. IV. LXX. V. Qumran.

I. Etymology and Semitic Isoglosses. The Hebrew noun *nešer* is to be viewed as a primary noun whose etymology cannot be explained on the basis of inner-Hebrew derivation. Middle Heb. *nāšar* piel, "to lacerate, tear to pieces,"[1] could be denominated (though cf. Arab. *nasara,* "to tear to pieces"). Middle Heb. *nešer,* "drop," is related etymologically to Middle Heb. *nāšar* qal, "to drop," "to fall, drop down."

The Middle Hebrew noun *nešer,* which has traditionally been interpreted as "eagle," is attested by isoglosses in most of the Semitic languages and dialects. In East Semitic, Akk. *našru,* attested once, probably represents a West Semitic loanword.[2] The term *ērû* (etymologically identical with Heb. *'aryēh,* "lion"!), normally translated "eagle,"[3] refers presumably to the lammergeier, or great bearded vulture (*Gypaetos barbatus;* cf. also *zību,* probably the "griffon vulture" [*Gyps fulvus*]).[4] Regarding South Semitic, one

---

nešer. J. Achaj, "The Eagle and the Phoenix," *BethM* 11 (1965/66) 144-47 (Heb.); I. Aharoni, "On Some Animals Mentioned in the Bible," *Osiris* 5 (1938) 461-78; F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal Life in Palestine* (Jerusalem, 1935); idem, *Animal and Man in Bible Lands. Collection de travaux de l'Académie Internationale d'Historie des Sciences* 10 (Leiden, 1960); G. Cansdale, *Animals of Bible Lands* (Exeter, 1970); M. Dor, *Leqsîqôn Zô'ôlôgî* (Tel Aviv, 1965) (Hebrew); G. R. Driver, "Birds in the OT. I: Birds in the Law," *PEQ* 87 (1955) 5-20; idem, "Birds in the OT. II: Birds in Life," *PEQ* 87 (1955) 129-40; idem, "Once Again: Birds in the Bible," *PEQ* 90 (1958) 56-58; G. I. Emmerson, "The Structure and Meaning of Hosea VIII 1-3," *VT* 25 (1975) 700-710; *Fauna and Flora of the Bible. Prepared in Cooperation with the Committee on Translations of the United Bible Societies* (London/New York/Stuttgart, [2]1980); J. Feliks, *The Animal World of the Bible* (Tel Aviv, 1962); idem, "Geier," *BHHW,* I, 533f.; idem, "Eagle," *EncJud,* VI, 337f.; idem, "Vultures," *EncJud,* XVI, 232f.; W. H. Gispen, "The Distinction Between Clean and Unclean," *OTS* 5 (1948) 190-96; W. Heimpel, *Tierbilder in der sumerischen Literatur. StPohl* 2 (1968); O. Keel, *Jahwes Entgegnung an Ijob. FRLANT* 121 (1978), esp. 69f.; W. Kornfeld, "Reine und unreine Tiere im AT," *Kairos* 7 (1965) 134-47; B. Landsberger, *The Fauna of Ancient Mesopotamia. MSL* VIII/2 (Rome, 1962), esp. 130; R. Meinertzhagen, *Birds of Arabia* (Edinburgh, 1954), esp. 382f.; A. Parmelee, *All the Birds of the Bible, Their Stories, Identification and Meaning* (New York, 1959); W. Paschen, *Rein und unrein: Untersuchung zur biblischen Wortgeschichte. SANT* 24 (1970); W. Pinney, *The Animals in the Bible* (Philadelphia, 1964); L. Prijs, "Ergänzungen zum talmudisch-hebräischen Wörterbuch," *ZDMG* 120 (1970) 20; A. Salonen, *Vögel und Vogelfang im alten Mesopotamien. AnAcScFen* B 180 (Helsinki, 1973); T. Schneider and E. Stemplinger, "Adler," *RAC,* I, 87-94; W. von Soden, "*aqrabu* und *našru,*" *AfO* 18 (1957/58) 393; R. K. Yerkes, "The Unclean Animals of Lev. 11 and Deut. 14," *JQR* 14 (1923/24) 1-29.

1. Jastrow, 942b.
2. Von Soden, 393.
3. *AHw,* I, 247.
4. Landsberger, 129f.

should first refer to the Arabic noun *nasr (nisr/nusr),* which functions primarily as a vague designation for the genus of vultures in general (with the exception of *raḫam,* "eaglelike vulture"), though in certain instances also for "eagles" (cf. OSA *nsr* as a divine or male name).[5] In Ethiopic, which has been strongly influenced by the tradition of biblical translation, the noun *nēsr* can mean both "eagle" and "vulture."[6]

Among the Northwest Semitic isoglosses regarding Biblical Heb. *nešer* the following should be mentioned. The noun *nšr* occurs rather frequently in Ugaritic texts and is usually translated "eagle" with no further discussion.[7] Further witnesses include Old Aram./Biblical Aram. *n^ešar;*[8] Sam. *nēšor/anšor;* Nab. *nšr;*[9] Palmyr. *nšry* (masc. noun);[10] Mand. *nišra;*[11] in the Aramaic of Deir ʿAlla: *nšr, nšrt,* in connection with an obscure list of birds;[12] Post-Biblical Aram. *n^ešar;*[13] Syr. *nēšrāʾ;*[14] and Middle Heb. *nešer.*[15]

II. OT Occurrences.

1. *Overview.* The term *nešer* occurs 26 times in the OT (excluding 1 S. 26:20 conj.): 4 times each in Jeremiah (4:13; 48:40; 49:16,22) and Ezekiel (1:10; 10:14; 17:3,7); 3 times each in Deuteronomy (14:12; 28:49; 32:11) and Proverbs (23:5; 30:17,19); twice in Job (9:26; 39:27); and in Ex. 19:4; Lev. 11:13; 2 S. 1:23; Hos. 8:1; Mic. 1:16; Hab. 1:8; Ob. 4; Isa. 40:31; Ps. 103:5; and Lam. 4:19. To this one can add Biblical Aram. *n^ešar,* occurring twice in the book of Daniel (4:30[Eng. v. 27]; 7:4).

2. *Zoological Considerations.* An initial overview of the various attributes and characteristics that OT texts associate with the *nešer* already reveals that the reference is not normally to an "eagle" but rather to some species of vulture.

In the OT the *nešer* is well known because of its swiftness (*qll,* 2 S. 1:23; Jer. 4:13; Lam. 4:19). On the one hand, this swiftness is associated with its voracity: It is "swift to devour" (Hab. 1:8) and "swoops down on the prey" (Job 9:26; cf. also 39:29f.; Hos. 8:1). On the other hand, it is associated with the bird's extraordinary ability in flight: it comes "with great wings and long pinions, rich in plumage of many colors" (Ezk. 17:3); it has "great wings and much plumage" (Ezk. 17:7; cf. the expression "*nešer*

---

5. See Lane, 2789b-90a; see also R. Dozy, *Supplément aux Dictionnaires arabes* (Paris, ²1927), II, 674b; ContiRossini, 188.

6. *LexLingAeth,* 641.

7. See *UT,* no. 1714; *WUS,* no. 1868; M. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 282, no. 396. Whitaker, 460, lists 21 occurrences.

8. Vogt, *LexLingAram,* 116a; Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1975), 543b; Beyer, 642, "vulture."

9. *DNSI,* II, 765.

10. *PNPI,* 100.

11. *MdD,* 300b.

12. Ll. 8a, 8b, J. Hoftijzer et al., *Aramaic Texts from Deir ʿAlla. DMOA* 256 (1976), 200, 204. Cf. H. and M. Weippert, "Die 'Bileam'-Inschrift von *Tell Dēr ʿAllá,*" *ZDPV* 98 (1982) 94ff.

13. Jastrow, 942b.

14. *LexSyr,* 451b.

15. Jastrow, 942b.

wings," Dnl. 7:4). Indeed, it "flies up and spreads its wings in flight" (Jer. 49:22; cf. Ex. 19:4; Dt. 28:49; Jer. 48:40), and so "flies toward heaven" (Prov. 23:5). Thus did "the way of the *nešer* in the sky" (Prov. 30:19) become proverbially wonderful and incomprehensible. The flight of the *nešer* takes it aloft (*gbh* hiphil), and it makes its nest there "among the stars" (Ob. 4). Especially Job 39:27-30 speaks extensively about the habitation of the *nešer:* At God's command the *nešer* flies up high, and "it makes its nest on high"; "it dwells on the rock and makes its home in the fastness of the rocky crag. Thence it spies out the prey; its eyes behold it afar off. Its young ones suck up blood; and where the slain are, there it (too) is."[16] From there it leads its young out, "flutters over its young, spreading out its wings, catching them, bearing them on its pinions" (Dt. 32:11). The OT also says that the *nešer* is "bald" (*qorḥâ,* "baldness," Mic. 1:16). Furthermore, the *nešer* allegedly has the ability to renew (*ḥdš* hithpael) its "youth" (*n*e*'ûrîm)* (Ps. 103:5). Finally, one should note that the *nešer* commences both OT lists of ritually unclean birds (Lev. 11:13; Dt. 14:12).

It is immediately clear that some of these fragmentary descriptions of the *nešer* do not fit an eagle at all, e.g., that it is bald (on its head and neck, Mic. 1:16), and that it feeds on carrion (Job 39:29f.; cf. also Prov. 30:17). Biblical commentators noted this as early as the Middle Ages (e.g., R. Tam, ca. 1100-1171, Tos. at Bab. *Ḥul.* 63a). Current scholarship generally agrees that the OT *nešer* normally refers to a vulture, in all probability to the griffon vulture *(Gyps fulvus),* the great vulture with an almost 3-m. (9-ft.) wingspan and pale-brown plumage. This bird, which was once fairly numerous in ancient Palestine, can still be seen today in the Negeb. Most of the characteristics attributed by the OT to the *nešer* fit this great carrion vulture.[17]

This does not mean, however, that all OT occurrences refer unequivocally to vultures. At the very least, the great *nešer* in Ezk. 17:3,7 is presumably an eagle;[18] it remains extremely doubtful, however, that the texts discussed by Driver (Ex. 19:4; Dt. 32:11; 2 S. 1:23; Prov. 23:5; Jer. 4:13; Lam. 4:19) also refer to the eagle.[19] It does remain true, however, that a vulture circling high in the sky is difficult to distinguish from an eagle, and that accordingly in antiquity the vulture was not infrequently taken to be an eagle (e.g., Aristotle and Plinius).[20] Furthermore, it is quite possible that occasionally in the OT the *nešer* might refer simply to "a great bird of prey."[21] One should remember, however, that as a designation of species, the *nešer* refers to the griffon vulture *(Gyps fulvus),* while the eagle, which was much rarer and less familiar in ancient Palestine, was normally called *'ayiṭ.*[22]

---

16. Concerning the text, see G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 494; vv. 27f. are not, however, to be viewed as glosses to Jer. 49:16; cf. *BHS.*

17. Cf., e.g, Aharoni, 471f; Driver, *PEQ* 87 (1955) 8f.; Feliks, *Animal World,* 63-71; idem, *BHHW,* I, 533f.; idem, *EncJud,* VI, 337f.; idem, *EncJud,* XVI, 232f.; Keel, 69f.

18. See, e.g., Feliks, *BHHW,* I, 533f.

19. *PEQ* 87 (1955) 9; 90 (1958) 56.

20. See Cansdale, 142-46; *Fauna and Flora,* 82f.; also Schneider and Stemplinger, 87-91.

21. Keel, 69 n. 234.

22. See discussion below.

The low estimation of the vulture and high estimation of the eagle as a royal bird, an attitude inaugurated in the ancient Near East by the Greeks, is a prejudice that apparently already lies behind the consistent LXX rendering *(aetós),* which was then picked up and promulgated by the Vulg. *(aquila)* and continues today; this attitude, however, contradicts the state of affairs in ancient Israel's cultural environment. For example, Egypt attests a vulture cult quite early, but no corresponding eagle cult. The vulture goddess Nekhbet played a prominent and completely positive role as the regional goddess of Upper Egypt.[23] In ancient Mesopotamia, especially in the earliest periods, the vulture not infrequently occupied the position of the royal eagle.[24] A. Salonen remarks that "it is likely that the great birds of prey portrayed in antithetical compositions on the earliest seals and reliefs with outspread wings, long tails, and long bodies, represent not the eagle but rather the vulture."[25]

The following types of vultures are mentioned in the OT in addition to the *nešer:* the *peres,* the second in the lists of ritually unclean birds (Lev. 11:13; Dt. 14:12; only here in the OT), is usually identified as the bearded lammergeier, or great bearded vulture *(Gypaetus barbatus).*[26] The *'ozniyâ,* third in the lists of unclean birds (Lev. 11:13; Dt. 14:12; not otherwise found in the OT), is probably the cinereous vulture *(Aegypius monachus),* also known as the black vulture.[27] The carrion vulture *rāḥām/rāḥāmâ* appears only in the lists of ritually unclean birds (Lev. 11:18; Dt. 14:17) and is usually identified with the rather small Egyptian vulture *(Neophron percnopterus).*[28] In contrast, the *'ayiṭ* (cf. Ugar. *'ṭ,* a kind of edible bird),[29] which the OT describes as a bird of prey, is probably the designation for a kind of eagle (occurring only in Gen. 15:11; Job 28:7; Isa. 18:6; 46:11; Jer. 12:9 [bis];[30] Ezk. 39:4).[31] It is a carnivore (Isa. 18:6; Jer. 12:8f.; Ezk. 39:4; cf. Gen. 15:11) whose penetrating vision is proverbial (Job 28:7); Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 46:11) portrays the invincible Babylonian king metaphorically as an *'ayiṭ.*[32]

III. OT Usage.

1. *The Prophets.* a. *Hosea.* One of the earliest witnesses for *nešer* is Hos. 8:1 (MT?). Here presumably the swiftness, decisiveness, and voracity of the vulture are being evoked as a metaphor for the Assyrians advancing under Tiglath-pileser III in 733 B.C.: "Like a vulture [the hostile army comes] over Yahweh's house."

---

23. See E. Brunner-Traut, "Adler," *LexÄg,* I, 64f.; "Geier," *LexÄg,* II, 513-15; "Nechbet," *RÄR,* 507f.

24. See Bodenheimer, *Animal and Man in Bible Lands,* 54.

25. P. 81.

26. E.g., Aharoni, 472; Feliks, *Animal World,* 68-71; idem, *BHHW,* I, 534; idem, *EncJud,* XVI, 233; *HAL,* III, 969.

27. E.g., Aharoni, 471; Feliks, *Animal World,* 68-71; *BHHW,* I, 534; *EncJud,* XVI, 233; *KBL*[3], 766.

28. E.g., Feliks, *Animal World,* 68-71; idem, *BHHW,* I, 534; idem, *EncJud,* XVI, 233.

29. *UT,* no. 1838.

30. But see Driver, *PEQ* 87 (1955) 139f.

31. Cf. *HAL,* II, 816.

32. See Feliks, *Animal World,* 66; Dor, 246f.; Feliks, *EncJud,* VI, 337f.

G. I. Emmerson translates the entire verse: "Set the trumpet to your lips as a herald (making a proclamation) against the house of the Lord."[33] This is based on N. H. Tur-Sinai's suggested emendation: *naśśār/naššār* instead of *nešer*, a suggestion that, while not entirely off the mark, founders on the fact that the noun *naśśār/naššār* is not attested, while in contrast *nešer* appears fairly frequently in connection with strife and dispute (e.g., Dt. 28:49; Jer. 4:13; Lam. 4:19; Hab. 1:8; cf. also 2 S. 1:23; Jer. 48:40; 49:22; Ezk. 17:3,7).[34]

b. *Micah.* The characteristic baldness (head/neck) of the vulture is used as a comparison in a presumably genuine text of Micah from the time between Tiglath-pileser III's first campaign to Palestine (734) and the conquest of Samaria (722).[35] In view of God's imminent strike, Micah calls his listeners to mourning: "Make yourselves bald and cut off your hair, for the children of your delight; make yourselves as bald as a vulture *(nešer)*, for they shall go from you into exile" (1:16). Such cutting of one's hair accompanies the dirge (Jer. 16:6) and the lament over the fall of a land or city (esp. Isa. 3:24; 15:2; 22:12; Jer. 47:5; 48:37; Ezk. 7:18; 27:31).[36]

c. *Jeremiah.* In his dramatic announcement of the "foe from the north" (chs. 4–6), Jeremiah describes the hostile army with reference to the swiftness of the vulture ("swifter than vultures," *qallû minnᵉšārîm,* 4:13), recalling Hosea's earlier announcement (see discussion above). The Edom oracle in Jer. 49:7-22 again uses the vulture as a metaphor for Yahweh's predicted strike (against the Edomites): "Behold, he will mount up and fly swiftly like a vulture, and spread his wings against Bozrah" (v. 22). Although the original reference was to the power of Babylon, after 587 it was reinterpreted because of Edom's role; the statement also found its way into the Moab oracle (Jer. 48:1-47; v. 40).[37] Both passages involve irony: both hostile nations, who themselves live in high places like proud vultures (Jer. 49:16 apparently stands in traditio-historical connection with Ob. 4),[38] are themselves soon to be attacked by a mighty vulture and ultimately subjected.

d. *Habakkuk.* At approximately the same time as Jeremiah, Habakkuk responds to the lament of the prophet with the announcement of the Chaldeans (*hakkaśdîm,* 1:5-11): "They fly like a vulture swift to devour" (v. 8).

e. *Ezekiel.* The noun *nešer* occurs 4 times in the book of Ezekiel in the first main section (chs. 1–24). Although one cannot determine exactly whether by *nešer* Ezekiel understands an eagle or a vulture, its description as a bird "with great wings and long pinions, rich in plumage of many colors" (17:3; see also v. 7), probably refers not to a griffon vulture but presumably to an eagle.[39]

---

33. P. 710.

34. Tur-Sinai, *The Book of Job* (Jerusalem, 1957), 550. Cf. J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the OT* (Oxford, 1968), 26-28.

35. H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1990), 39-66, esp. 53f., 64.

36. → גלח *gillaḥ (gillach),* III, 10-12.

37. See W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (^{3}1968), 283, 290-93.

38. Cf. H. W. Wolff, *Obadiah and Jonah* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1986), 34.

39. This is also the consistent understanding of, e.g., W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), in loc. Cf. Feliks, *Animal World,* 66; idem, *EncJud,* VI, 337.

The account of the prophet's calling (1:1–3:15), more specifically the description of the appearance of Yahweh's glory (1:4-28), includes a portrayal of four creatures emerging from a great storm phenomenon (vv. 5-12). V. 5 describes them as "having human form," a statement then expanded by degrees, presumably by Ezekiel's school. First, "each had four faces, and each of them had four wings" (v. 6). The four faces unequivocally symbolize an all-encompassing divine power: the face of a man in front, God's reflection and vice-regent; on the right a lion, on the left an ox, the preeminently royal and the strongest land animals; and then (at the back?), the *nešer,* probably the royal eagle. It is quite possible that "a hidden scale of values" reveals itself here.[40]

The same symbolism of divine power also penetrated into the great vision of Jerusalem's idolatrous worship (8:1–11:25; 10:14), inserted presumably by a more recent redactor.

The section concerning Zedekiah's treaty violation (17:1-24) includes metaphorical speech about a great *nešer,* a cedar, and a young vine. On the basis of the attributes applied to it, the *nešer* is to be identified as an eagle: "The great eagle with great wings and long pinions, with full plumage, which had brightly colored feathers, came to Lebanon and took the top of the cedar" (v. 3).[41] This eagle, the Babylonian king, is joined in v. 7 by "another great eagle, with great wings and much plumage," representing the Egyptian king Psammetichus II.[42] Between the two great eagles stands the vine, Judah.

f. *Obadiah.* At the time of Jerusalem's oppressive situation after 587, Obadiah picks up an orally transmitted statement about the habitation of the vulture and prophesies against the Edomites living in the mountains: "(Even though) you build like a vulture in the heights (or if) your nest [be set between the stars] yet I am (nonetheless) bringing you down from there, saying of Yahweh" (v. 4).[43] The oral tradition standing behind this passage reappears in the post-Jeremianic oracles on Edom and Moab (Jer. 48:40; 49:16).[44]

g. *Deutero-Isaiah.* In what was originally a presumably independent disputation oracle (Isa. 40:27-31), Deutero-Isaiah says: "But those who wait for Yahweh shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings like vultures" (v. 31). Though it is theoretically possible that this usage reflects remnants of a phoenix motif (renewing plumage), the statement refers primarily to the remarkable strength of the vulture: "While those who draw only on their own natural strength ultimately fall to the ground . . . those gifted with the strength of hope in Yahweh soar aloft as if on miraculously grown wings."[45]

---

40. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 126; on the four creatures see L. Dürr, *Ezechiels Vision von der Erscheinung Gottes (Ez. c. 1 und 10) im Lichte der vorderasiatischen Altertumskunde* (Würzburg, 1917), 31-54.

41. Concerning the text, see Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 354; see also II.2 above.

42. See Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 362.

43. See Wolff, *Obadiah and Jonah,* 39-41; concerning the text, 34.

44. See III.1.c above.

45. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7). BK* XI/1 (1978), 101, who does, however, translate *n*ᵉ*šārîm* with "eagles." Cf. Achaj, 144-47.

By all appearances the same message, now generalized, is continued in the late (postexilic) Psalm 103.[46] Yahweh is praised, "who satisfies your longing [LXX; see *BHS*] that your youth be renewed like the vulture" (v. 5); here, too, the primary focus is "a symbol of renewed, young strength."[47]

2. *Pentateuch.* a. *Ritual Uncleanness.* In the Priestly (Ex. 25; Nu. 10) and Deuteronomic laws (Dt. 12–26) of the Pentateuch, the *nešer* (griffon vulture) is defined together with, among others, the *peres* (great bearded vulture), the *'ozniyâ* (black vulture), and the *rāḥām/rāḥāmâ* (Egyptian vulture) as ritually unclean.[48] Thus we read in the section concerning clean and unclean animals (Lev. 11:1-47): "And these you shall have in abomination among the birds *(tᵉšaqqᵉṣû);* they shall not be eaten; they are an abomination *(šeqeṣ):* the griffon vulture, the great bearded vulture, the black vulture" (v. 13); and the presumably post-Deuteronomistic additions in Dt. 14[49] present the following regulations: "You shall not eat any abominable thing. . . . You may eat all clean birds. But these are the ones which you shall not eat: the griffon vulture . . ." (Dt. 14:3,11f.). These definitions are naturally primarily theological-religious qualifications, reflecting in part older notions of animism and totemism, and these birds may in part have functioned as holy animals for certain deities, something confirmed by a glance at Israel's surrounding cultures; because of its swiftness, the vulture could even be associated with demonic powers.[50] Although in Israel, too, the vulture could symbolize Yahweh's divine power, as the representative of non-Israelite religious notions and cultic practices it was an abomination as far as OT ritual was concerned.[51] This understanding of ritual was maintained in ancient Judaism.

b. *As a Symbol of Yahweh.* Other characteristics, however, made the vulture an appropriate symbol of Yahweh's mighty and caring activities. Thus we read in the divine discourse introducing the Sinai theophany (Ex. 19:1-25; 20:18-21): "You have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on vultures' wings and brought you to myself" (19:4). This statement could be portraying Yahweh as a vulture living on the Sinai, who on his mighty wings carried his endangered young in Egypt, namely, the people of God, to the mount of God.[52]

A related motif is found in the Song of Moses (Dt. 32, presumably part of the older stratum [E?]).[53] Here, too, Yahweh is the vulture living in the wilderness mountains who has taken care of its young, the Israelites: "He found him [Israel] in a desert land. . . . Like a vulture that guards its nest and flutters over its young, spreading out its

46. Cf. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1989), 290.

47. Ibid., 291, though Kraus translates as "eagle."

48. → טמא *ṭāmē'* (V, 330-42); cf. esp. the studies by Yerkes; Gispen; Driver, *PEQ* 87 (1955); Kornfeld; and Paschen.

49. See H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 53.

50. Cf. II.2 above; Heimpel, 425, 428; also K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 150-52.

51. See esp. b below. Cf. W. Zimmerli, *OT Theology in Outline* (Eng. trans., Atlanta, 1978), 130f.

52. Cf. B. S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus. OTL* (1974), 366f.

53. See Preuss, *Deuteronomium,* 61, 165-69.

wings, catching them, bearing them on its pinions" (v. 11). The sovereign vulture here represents Yahweh's superior power, power that can also be transferred to "his young," the God-fearing Israelites, if they wait for Yahweh (Isa. 40:31; cf. Ps. 103:5).[54]

c. *Other Uses.* In an isolated instance the motif of the vulturelike swiftness of the enemy finds its way into the Pentateuch, in a Deuteronomistic addition in Dt. 28:47-68(69[29:1]).[55] Here the Babylonian intervention is transformed and generalized retrospectively into a threatening admonition: "Yahweh will bring a nation against you from afar, from the end of the earth, [as swift and unencumbered] as the vulture flies" (v. 49).

3. *In Proverbial Wisdom.* OT wisdom speaks especially about the vulture's swiftness. This motif, which tradition history can trace back to David's lament over Saul and Jonathan ("[in battle] they were swifter than vultures, stronger than lions," 2 S. 1:23), is used in a variety of ways in proverbial wisdom.

The vulture's swift flight toward heaven is used in the Egyptian-influenced collection (Prov. 22:17–24:22) to illustrate the swift disappearance of wealth (23:5). The Egyptian wisdom Instruction of Amenemope characterizes riches as "geese that have flown away to the heavens."[56]

In Job's third discourse (9:1–10:22) the flight of the vulture becomes a metaphor for the transitoriness of Job's own days: "My days are swifter than a runner . . . they go by like skiffs of reed, like a vulture flying to and fro for prey" (vv. 25f.).[57]

Prov. 30:17 uses the voracity of the vulture in an admonition against scorning one's parents: "The eye that mocks a father and scorns to obey a mother will be picked out by the ravens of the valley and eaten by the vultures."[58]

Otherwise, OT wisdom views the vulture as a wonderful work of God: "The way of a vulture in the sky" remains too wonderful and incomprehensible for human beings (Prov. 30:19). The first divine discourse in the book of Job characterizes the vulture's lofty flight and lofty nest as a sovereign divine wonder (39:27).

4. *Daniel.* The noun *n^{e}šar* occurs twice in the Aramaic section of the book of Daniel (4:30[33]; 7:4); it is uncertain whether *n^{e}šar* refers here to a vulture or to an eagle.

The first occurrence is found in the account of King Nebuchadnezzar's illness (3:31–4:34[4:1-37]; first half of the 2nd century B.C.).[59] Nebuchadnezzar, who by all appearances replaced Nabonidus, the original focus of the tradition,[60] was ostracized during his affliction "till his hair grew as long as vultures' [feathers] and his nails were like birds' [claws]" (4:30[33]).

---

54. See III.1.g above.
55. See Preuss, *Deuteronomium,* 59, 157.
56. See O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 271; *ANET,* 422.
57. Concerning the text see Fohrer, *Hiob,* 199.
58. On the word combination in v. 19a cf. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos,* 355.
59. Cf. J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel. HSM* 16 (1977), 1-65.
60. See L. F. Hartman and A. A. di Lella, *The Book of Daniel. AB* 23 (1978), 168-80.

The second occurrence is found in connection with the vision of the four beasts and the man (7:1-28); though in its present form this vision aims at Antiochus IV Epiphanes, it had an extremely complicated prehistory (cf., e.g., the parallel in the narrative of the statue of four metals in ch. 2). In its present form the vision contains a symbolic description of the four great kingdoms: the Babylonians, the Medes, the Persians, and the Greeks. The Babylonian Empire is "like a lion and had wings like an eagle" (7:4). These eagles' wings naturally represent the sovereign power of the Babylonian kingdom, power taken away once and for all by Cyrus's conquest of Babylon.

IV. LXX. Although the LXX consistently renders *nešer* (like Aram. *n^e^šar*) with *aetós* (Jer. 48:40 is missing in the LXX), this translation says nothing definitive about the zoological understanding of the LXX interpreters, since, among other things, in classical antiquity vultures were not infrequently reckoned among eagles.[61]

V. Qumran. In the Qumran writings the word *nešer* occurs in 1QpHab 3:6-12: "They [the Kittim] come from afar, from the islands of the sea, to devour all the peoples like a vulture [eagle?] that cannot be satisfied." 4QDibHam 6:7 (bis) constitutes a free citation of Ex. 19:4.

Kronholm

---

61. See II.2 above.

נְתִיבָה *n^e^ṯîḇâ* → דֶּרֶךְ *dereḵ (derekh)* (III, 270-93)

נָתַךְ *nāṯaḵ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. General Usage: 1. Qal; 2. Niphal; 3. Hiphil; 4. Hophal; 5. Substantival Constructions; 6. LXX. III. Theological Meaning: 1. God's Wrath Pours Forth; 2. Smelting in the Fiery Oven; 3. Creation. IV. Qumran.

---

nāṯaḵ. O. Eissfeldt, "Eine Einschmelzstelle am Tempel zu Jerusalem," *FuF* 13 (1937) 163-64 = *Ras Schamra und Sanchunjaton* (Halle, 1939), 42-46 = *KlSchr* II (1963), 107-9; J. Jeremias, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung. WMANT* 10 (^{2}1977); T. N. D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials: A Study of the Civil Government Officials of the Israelite Monarchy. CB* 5 (1971); W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25.*

I. Etymology. The root *ntk* is found in Akkadian as *natāku* with the fundamental meaning "drip, drop";[1] in Ugaritic as *ntk*, "pour,"[2] *ytk*, "drip, drop";[3] and in the so-called Ya'udi language of the royal inscriptions of Zenjirli: *hdd ḥr' lytkh*, "may Hadad pour out his wrath."[4]

Discounting all conjectural occurrences,[5] *ntk* occurs 21 times in the Hebrew texts of the OT in verbal forms, and once as the subst. *hittûḵ*. The fundamental meaning is "pour, gush forth," which in connection with the activity of metal working then merges with "melt, smelt." The semantic connection most unique to the verb *nāṯaḵ* is that with water or liquids in general (something sufficiently attested by the Akkadian examples); in the OT, however, the verb is governed only once directly by the subj. "water" *(mayim)*, and once by the subj. "rain" *(māṭār)*; twice a liquid is used as a comparison for an event designated by *ntk* (water in Job 3:24; milk in Job 10:10). It is thus striking that, except for the instances mentioned, the root *ntk* is always used in the figurative sense when not intended with the meaning "melt, smelt."

II. General Usage.

1. *Qal.* The term *nāṯaḵ* occurs 7 times in the qal with the meaning "pour forth." At the same time, the action of gushing water designated by this root does indeed refer to other phenomena. Job's cries of distress (*šᵉ'āgâ*, pl., Job 3:24) are poured forth like water; above all, however, it is Yahweh's anger *('ap)* and wrath *(ḥēmâ)* that are poured out over the Judeans who want to go to Egypt (Jer. 42:18), over the cities of Judah and the streets of Jerusalem (Jer. 44:6), and over Jerusalem itself (2 Ch. 12:7; 34:25). This is related to the use of the qal in Dnl. 9:11 with the subjs. "curse" *('ālâ)* and "oath" *(šᵉḇû'â)*, which have been poured out as catastrophic powers over the people of God, and in Dnl. 9:27 with the subjects "annihilation" *(kālâ)* and "what is decided" *(neḥᵉrāṣâ)*, which lend to the events associated with *nāṯaḵ* a certain apocalyptic tone (cf. Isa. 10:23; 28:22).[6]

2. *Niphal.* The term *ntk* is used 8 times in the niphal, and in 6 cases is to be translated as "pour forth, be poured forth." The semantically natural subjs. "water" (*mayim*, 2 S. 21:10) and "rain" (*māṭār*, Ex. 9:33) are used once each as references for *nittaḵ;* otherwise *ntk* is used 4 times in the sense "pour forth, be poured forth"

WMANT 41 (1973); idem, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45. WMANT* 52 (1981); C. C. Torrey, "The Foundry of the Second Temple at Jerusalem," *JBL* 55 (1936) 247-60. → אנף *'ānap ('ānaph)* (I, 348-60); → חמה *ḥēmâ (chēmāh)* (IV, 462-65).

1. Cf. *AHw*, II, 765b; *CAD*, XI/2, 115b.
2. *KTU*, 1.14, 28.
3. *KTU*, 1.19 II, 33; cf. *UT*, no. 1716; *WUS*, no. 1871.
4. *KAI*, 214:23; cf. *DNSI*, II, 764f., s.v. *nšk; TSSI*, II, 13, 23.
5. Concerning 2 Ch. 34:9, cf. *BHS* and W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* XXI (1955), in loc.
6. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja 28–39. BK* X/3 (1982), 1080; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1983), 240-42; idem, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 255f.

in reference to "anger" and "wrath" (*'ap̱; ḥēmâ*) that pour forth on "this place" (the Jerusalem temple); on people, animals, all the trees of the field, and the fruit of the ground (Jer. 7:20); and on Josiah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem (2 Ch. 34:21). Nah. 1:6 compares the pouring forth of God's wrath *(ḥēmâ)* with a spreading fire. This picks up on that particular semantic component influenced by the use of the root *ntk* in connection with the working of metal (thus the LXX, with *tḗkei,* is probably reading *ntk* piel in Nah. 1:6),[7] namely, "melt, smelt," or "be melted, smelted." Those belonging to the house of Israel are to be melted in the fire of Yahweh's wrath (*'eḇrâ;* Ezk. 22:21). In Ezk. 24:11 the niphal of *ntk* refers to the melting (= passing away) of the uncleanness *(ṭum'â)* of the kettle that Yahweh[8] places on the fire.

3. *Hiphil.* The hiphil of *ntk* occurs especially in connection with the process of metal smelting with the meaning "to cause to melt" in Ezk. 22:20, here, too, with God as the subject and a metaphorical reference to the house of Israel. The form *hittîḵ* also occurs with God as the subject in Job 10:10 in connection with a product of creation with the meaning "pour out, empty."

In 2 K. 22:9 and 2 Ch. 34:17 the understanding of the two hiphil forms referring to the actions of the servants of King Josiah is disputed. Although the usual translation is "empty out," the suggestion that one render these verbal forms as "melt down" should be seriously considered.[9] This is supported by the LXX translation *chōneúō.* One would then presuppose the existence of a smelting area associated with the temple of Jerusalem where money that had been offered or collected was cast into bars or ingots; from these one then extracted whatever portions were necessary to cover expenditures.

4. *Hophal.* The context makes clear that the only hophal form (Ezk. 22:22) is to be interpreted as the passive of a causatively understood hiphil, "be melted."

5. *Substantival Constructions.* The substantival construction *hittûk* (Ezk. 22:22) refers to the process of smelting. The construction is disputed. *HAL* understands it as a secondary form of *ntk* hiphil, *BLe* as a *qiṭṭûl* construction derived from the hiphil, and G. Fohrer as a mixed construction.[10]

6. *LXX.* The LXX renders *ntk* with *stázō* (6 times), *chōneúō* (7 times), *chéō* (Jer. 7:20), *tḗkō* (Ezk. 24:11; Nah. 1:6), *amélgō* (Job 10:10), *epérchomai* (Dnl. 9:11), *dídōmi* pass. (Dnl. 9:27). Job 3:24 is a free translation; the variant *ekkaíō* is the reading offered by 2 Ch. 34:21,25.

7. Cf. W. Rudolph, *Nahum. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 152.
8. Cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 494f.
9. Cf. Eissfeldt; Torrey; Mettinger; E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige,* part II: *1. Kön. 17–2. Kön. 25. ATD* XI/2 (1984), 446.
10. *HAL,* I, 257; *BLe,* §61yγ; Fohrer, *Ezechiel. HAT* XIII (^{2}1955), 127.

III. Theological Meaning. The use of the root *ntk* is theologically interesting especially in connection with Yahweh's judgment.

1. *1. God's Wrath Pours Forth.* E. Johnson points out that passages in which *ntk* is associated with *'ap̱* or *ḥēmâ* or both never say that God pours out his anger, but rather that God's anger and wrath stream forth of their own accord.[11] Even if we leave undecided for the moment whether this constitutes a stylistic feature of the Deuteronomist,[12] the formula of the "pouring forth of Yahweh's anger (and wrath)" does in any case represent a particular way of referring to the issuance of God's judgment. It is found only in those passages in Jeremiah that Thiel has classified as products of Deuteronomistic redaction: 7:20; 42:18 (twice); 44:6; also 2 Ch. 12:7; 34:21,25 (the LXX emends the text of Chronicles according to 2 K. 22:13,17). Finally, the formula also appears in Nah. 1:6, in a Yahweh hymn focusing on his coming to judgment,[13] though the formula itself does not constitute part of the theophany portrayal as such (Nah. 1:3b-5), belonging rather to the framework (vv. 2a,6) that interprets the actual theophany portrayal.[14] The pouring forth of God's wrath is compared to fire, a semantic correlation also used in Jer. 7:20; 44:6; and 2 Ch. 34:25. It is difficult to decide whether this semantic connotation is influenced more by the subj. *ḥēmâ,* which like *ḥārôn* describes "the inward fire of the emotion of anger,"[15] or whether the phenomenon of a spreading fire is functioning as the conceptual background, or perhaps even the pouring out of molten metal (a possibility considering the use of the verb in reference to the smelting process).

This figure of speech involving God's anger being "poured out" is applied characteristically only to Israel. Thus during the postexilic period this expression might have become a standing designation for God's judgment on Israel as a fact of history manifested in the fall of Jerusalem, and less as one of God's acts; this would also explain why in this context God never occurs as the subject of *ntk.* That the formulaic expression "God's anger (or wrath) is poured out upon . . ." is somehow connected with theophany portrayals might be attested by the overall context of Nah. 1:6, by the reference in Jer. 7:20 to the universal scope of what will be affected by this pouring out of God's anger (human being and beast, trees of the field, fruit of the ground), and by the reference in Jer. 44:6 to "waste and desolation" as consequences of God's anger. That *ntk* in connection with the execution of Yahweh's judgment possessed a fixed meaning is shown by Dnl. 9:11,27; instead of God's anger or wrath, it is a curse *('ālâ)* and oath *(šᵉḇû'â)* or destruction *(kālâ)* and what is decreed *(neḥᵉrāṣâ)* that function as subjects of *ntk.*

2. *Smelting in the Fiery Oven.* Both Ezk. 22:20ff. and 24:11 also use the root *ntk* in connection with judgment on Israel. Even though the root does not really belong to the

11. → אנף *'ānap ('ānaph),* I, 358.
12. Cf. Thiel, *Jeremia 1–25,* 121; idem, *Jeremia 26–45,* 66, 72.
13. Cf. Jeremias, 5, 32, 169.
14. Ibid., 169.
15. W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the OT. OTL,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1961-67), I, 258.

specialized terminology of metal smelting, it occurs 5 times in the judgment oracle 22:17-22, whose metaphorical background is just such a smelting process involving metals. This text narrows the process of smelting down in an undifferentiated fashion to the process of destruction caused by the fire.[16] This doubtlessly constitutes secondary use of such imagery in comparison with the more differentiated portrayal in Isa. 1:22,25, where the smelting process *(ṣrp)* pursues the goal of purification and of removing all elements contaminating the precious metal. In contrast, Ezk. 22:17-22 is concerned only with the destructive power of the fire, so that in this context *ntk* acquires the semantic overtones of "destroy," "cause to pass away." The subject of this action in 22:20 is God himself. That in this connection Ezekiel draws precisely on the root *ntk* may derive from its fixed meaning as a term of judgment. In 24:11 *ntk* has the sense "cause to pass away" in reference to the pot's filthiness, though the pot does represent Israel itself.

3. *Creation.* The root *ntk* is theologically significant in Job 10:10 in reference to God's creative activity in connection with the metaphorical representation of the conception of human life within the womb. Here, as is often the case in the ancient Near East, incipient human life is compared with the curdling of milk. We may leave undecided in the present context whether the intended reference is to the general comparison "of the inception of one thing from another that constitutes its point of departure," or whether the metaphor refers to the physiological process involving the pouring out of the milklike sperm, which in the woman's body then curdles like cheese into an embryo.[17] What is decisive is only that the origin of human life is understood as the result of God's activity.

IV. Qumran. Among the Qumran texts, the root *ntk* occurs in CD 20:3 in connection with the metaphor of the smelting oven in which that person is to be smelted down, i.e., purified, who shies away from carrying out the regulations of the righteous though he himself counts among the ranks of the men of perfect holiness.

Stiglmair

16. Cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 464; Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12,* 43.

17. For the former see G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 217; for the latter, S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Comm. on the Book of Job. ICC,* 2 vols. (1921), I, 100; M. H. Pope, *Job. AB* 15 (^{3}1973), 80.

נָתַן *nāṯan;* מַתָּן *mattān;* מַתָּנָה *mattānâ;* מַתַּת *mattaṯ;* אֶתְנָה *'eṯnâ;* אֶתְנַן/אֶתְנָן *'eṯnān/'eṯnan*

Contents: I. Root: 1. Verb; 2. Substantives; 3. Personal Names. II. Usual Meaning: 1. Give; 2. Set, Put; 3. Turn into Something; 4. Allow; 5. Idiomatic Usage. III. Legal and Commercial Usage: 1. Compensation; 2. Remuneration for Work; 3. Sale; 4. Exchange; 5. Loan; 6. Wedding Contract; 7. Gifts. IV. Cultic Usage: 1. Sacrifice; 2. Consecratory Offerings; 3. Consecration of Slaves. V. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. Root.

1. *Verb.* The verb *nāṯan* derives probably from a monosyllabic root *d/tin,* whence derive the augmented forms *ytn* in Ugaritic and Phoenician, *nadānu* in Akkadian, and *ntn* in Amorite, Aramaic, Hebrew, and the "Canaanite" languages of Transjordan.[1] That the root is not attested in Arabic and the South Semitic languages suggests that it comes from the linguistic substratum of the Fertile Crescent.

In Biblical Hebrew, *ntn* occurs approximately 1900 times in the qal. It encompasses an especially broad concept whose fundamental meaning is not "give" or "make a gift" but rather "extend the hand" in order to place an object at a specific place or to give it

---

nāṯan. J. M. Baumgarten, "The Exclusion of 'Netinim' and Proselytes in 4Q Florilegium," *RevQ* 8 (1972) 87-96; M. Dandamayev, *Rabstvo v Vavilonii* (Moscow, 1974), 273-324; H. J. van Dijk, "A Neglected Connotation of Three Hebrew Verbs," *VT* 18 (1969) 16-30; R. P. Dougherty, *The Shirkûtu of Babylonian Deities. YOSR* 5/2 (1923); C. H. Gordon, "Egypto-Semitica," *RSO* 32 (1957) 267-77, esp. 273f.; J. C. Greenfield, "*našû — nadānu* and Its Congeners," *Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 19 (1977) 87-91; M. Haran, "The Gibeonites, the Nethinim and the Sons of Salomon's Servants," *VT* 11 (1961) 159-69; J. Jacobs, *Studies in Biblical Archaeology* (New York, 1894), 104-22; B. Jongeling, "L'expression *my ytn* dans l'AT," *VT* 24 (1974) 32-40; M. Z. Kaddari, "Biṭṭûy hammiš'ālāh *'my ytn,'*" *ShnatMiqr* 2 (1977) 189-95, XII; idem, "לתחביר הפועל נתן בלשון ספר יחזקאל" [Syntactic features of the verb *ntn* in Ezekiel], *BethM* 17 (1972) 493-97, 527; Y. Kobayashi, "A Study on the Transcription of the Old Babylonian Hypocoristic Names *i-din-ia* and *i-din-ia-tum,*" *Acta Sumerologica* 1 (1979) 12-18; C. J. Labuschagne, "The *našû — nadānu* Formula and Its Biblical Equivalent," *Travels in the World of the OT. FS M. A. Beek* (Assen, 1974) 176-80; idem, "נתן *ntn* to give," *TLOT,* II, 774-91; B. A. Levine, "The Netînîm," *JBL* 82 (1963) 207-12; idem, "Notes on a Hebrew Ostracon from Arad," *IEJ* 19 (1969) 49-51; M. Moreshet, "Tracing *laś'ēt we-latet,*" *Leš* 43 (1978/79) 295-301; S. C. Reif, "A Note on a Neglected Connotation of *ntn,*" *VT* 20 (1970) 114-16; S. Segert, "Noch zu den assimilierenden Verba im Hebräischen," *ArOr* 24 (1956) 132-34; E. A. Speiser, "Unrecognized Dedication," *IEJ* 13 (1963) 69-73; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 89f., 364, 383; J. P. Weinberg, "Neṯînîm und 'Söhne der Sklaven Salomos' im 6.-4. Jh. v. u. Z.," *ZAW* 87 (1975) 355-71; D. W. Young, "Notes on the Root נתן in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 10 (1960) 457-59; C. Zaccagnini, "Lo scambio dei doni nel Vicino Oriente durante i secoli XV-XIII," *OrAnt* 11 (1973) 324-28.

1. Cf. B. Kienast, "Das System der zweiradikaligen Verben im Akkadischen," *ZA* 55 (1963) 138-55; J. Macdonald, "New Thoughts on a Biliteral Origin for the Semitic Verb," *ALUOS* 5 (1963-65) 63-85.

over to another person, with or without compensation, as a possession. The result of this action is usually considered enduring and definitive. In the passive this action is rendered in Biblical Hebrew by the niphal (about 80 times) and the qal passive (8 times). In Biblical Aramaic, *n^eṯan* occurs 6 times, and the pass. ptcp. *n^eṯînîn* once (Ezr. 7:24); the hebraized form *n^eṯînîm* occurs 15 times.

2. *Substantives.* Three deverbatives are constructed with the preformative *ma-*: *mattān,* its feminine form *mattānâ* (Biblical Aram. *matt^enā'*), and *mattaṯ.* Furthermore, a prefixed *aleph* appears in the noun *'eṯnān/'eṯnan,* attested once in the short form *'eṯnâ* (Hos. 2:14 [Eng. v. 12]). The appended *-ān/-an* does not necessarily indicate that we are dealing with an Aramaic loanword. Indeed, the probable basis of construction is the impv. *t^enâ* with paragogic *-â.* Hence the short form *'eṯnâ* (Hos. 2:14[12]) might be older than *'eṯnān.* The purely prosthetic character of the *'e-* < *'a* can be seen in the hiphil *hiṯ^enû* and in the corresponding imperfect *ytnw* in Hos. 8:9f.: "But Ephraim has given the wages of harlots for services of love. Even though among the nations they give the wages of harlots. . . ."[2] All the substantives, *mattān, mattānâ, mattaṯ, 'eṯnâ,* and *'eṯnān/'eṯnan,* characterize the object of the action as a gift, payment, wages, or present.

3. *Personal Names.* The verb *nāṯan* and the substantives derived from it are used in constructing various personal names: *'elnāṯān* and *n^eṯan'ēl,* "El/God has given"; *y^ehônāṯān, yônāṯān, n^eṯanyāhû,* and *n^eṯanyâ,* "Yahweh has given"; *n^eṯan-meleḵ,* "the king has given"; *nāṯān,* a theophoric name reduced to the verbal element; *mattanyāh(û), mattiṯyāh(û),* "gift of Yahweh." The forms *mattān, matt^enay,* and *mattattâ* are abbreviated or hypocoristic nouns of the same construction. Furthermore, the forms *'eṯnān* (1 Ch. 4:7) and *'eṯnî* (1 Ch. 6:26[41]) occur, possibly as nicknames, as well as the Phoenician name *yaṯnî'ēl,* "El/God has given" (1 Ch. 26:2). The place-name *yiṯnān* (Josh. 15:23) is possibly related to the imperfect of *nāṯan.*

II. Usual Meaning.

1. *Give.* The verb *nāṯan* is often used with an accusative object and the prep. *l^e,* followed by a name designating a person, and means "give, pass on, transfer." Eve gives the fruit of the tree to Adam so that he may eat (Gen. 3:6,12); Abraham gives his servant a calf so that he might prepare it for the guests (18:7); he gives Hagar bread and a skin of water when he sends her away with the child (21:14).

The same construction can also mean that one places certain goods at the disposal of another person. For example, God puts plants and fruit-bearing trees at the disposal of the human beings (Gen. 1:29), then similarly animals, birds, and fish, that they might serve as nourishment for humans (9:3). In other cases it is more a matter of distribution. Thus parts of an inheritance are apportioned according to the inventory lists (Nu.

2. Cf. H. S. Nyberg, "Das textkritische Problem des ATs am Hoseabuch demonstriert," *ZAW* 52 (1934) 250f.

27:9-11; 36:2; Josh. 17:4,6; 19:49; Job 42:15; Ps. 111:6; Ezk. 47:23; cf. Josh. 13:14, 33; 14:3).

In the same way, one can also express the notion of "bestowing" (Gen. 45:22) or "granting a favor." God can give a person wealth, wisdom, and honor (Gen. 24:35; 1 K. 3:9), or even victory (Ps. 144:10), strength, or power (Dt. 8:18; Ps. 29:11; 68:36[35]). He gives a son (Gen. 17:16; 30:6; 1 K. 3:6; 5:21[7]; 1 Ch. 25:5; 28:5; 2 Ch. 2:11[12]) and offspring (*zera'*: Gen. 15:2f.; 1 S. 1:11), something that can also be said of a man (Gen. 30:1 with *yāhaḇ;* 38:9). God gives prayers a favorable hearing and grants what the petitioner's heart wishes (Ps. 20:5[4]; 21:3[2]; 106:15; Prov. 10:24). Eating and drinking and having a good time are such a gift *(mattaṯ)* of God (Eccl. 3:13; 5:18[19]), from whom even the sacrifices come that one offers to him (1 Ch. 29:14). The subst. *mattān* can refer to a present (Prov. 18:16) or to alms (Prov. 21:14; Sir. 4:3; 40:38), exactly like *mattānâ* (Est. 9:22). The generous person is called *'îš mattān* (Prov. 19:6) or *nôṯēn mattānôṯ* (Sir. 3:17); "according to his generosity" is rendered as *k^e^matt^e^naṯ yāḏô* (Dt. 16:17).

The delivery of burdens imposed through compulsory labor is also designated by *nāṯan.* According to Ex. 5:18, the Israelites in Egypt had to deliver *(nāṯan)* a prescribed number of bricks daily. For the production of those bricks, they were given *(nāṯan)* straw (Ex. 5:7,10,16,18). During the siege of Samaria, Ben-hadad demands that the Israelite king "deliver" to him silver and gold, his wives and his children (1 K. 20:5). Hezekiah had to "deliver" to Sennacherib all the money in the temple and in the royal treasury (2 K. 18:15). Later, Jehoiakim "delivers" the silver and gold that Neco demands as tribute (2 K. 23:35). In the metaphorical sense, one can "deliver" a person over to famine (Jer. 18:21), to a curse (Nu. 5:21), or to death (Ezk. 31:14).

Yet another semantic nuance is that of "giving forth"; thus *nāṯan š^e^ḵōḇeṯ* refers to the discharge of semen (Lev. 18:20,23; 20:15; Nu. 5:20), *nāṯan qôl* ("give forth sound") to a vocal utterance (Gen. 45:2; Ex. 9:23; Nu. 14:1; 1 S. 12:17f.; 2 S. 22:14; Ps. 18:14[13]; 68:34[33]; 77:18[17]; 104:12; Prov. 1:20; 2:3; 8:1; Jer. 2:15; 4:16; 22:20; 25:30; 48:34; Lam. 2:7; Joel 2:11; 4:16[3:16]; Am. 1:2; 3:4; Hab. 3:10), *nāṯan tōp̄* to the beating of the timbrel (Ps. 81:3[2]), *nāṯan rēaḥ* to the emanation of pleasing odors (Cant. 1:12; 2:13; 7:14[13]; Ezk. 6:13),[3] and *nāṯan 'ayin* to effervescent liquids (Prov. 23:31). This nuance is closely related to the meaning "bring forth" when natural forces are the subject. Thus the vine, the fig tree, and the fruit tree all bring forth their fruits (Lev. 26:20; Ps. 1:3; Joel 2:22; Zec. 8:12); the earth yields its products (Gen. 4:12; Lev. 26:20; Dt. 11:17; Isa. 55:10; Ezk. 36:8; cf. Gen. 49:20). God, however, is the one who gives the rains in their season (Lev. 26:4), the water in the wilderness (Isa. 43:20), and the calamitous hail (Ex. 9:23; Ps. 105:32). In the intellectual sphere, "ascribe righteousness" is rendered by *nāṯan ṣeḏeq* (Job 36:3), "ascribe unrighteousness" by *nāṯan tiplâ* (Job 1:22); this particular usage of *nāṯan* touches on the meaning "set, put."[4]

---

3. Cf. P. A. H. de Boer, "An Aspect of Sacrifice," *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel. SVT* 23 (1972), 37ff.

4. See II.2 below.

2. *Set, Put.* The verb *nāṯan* is frequently used with the meaning "set, put, place," often accompanied by the preps. *b*ᵉ, *l*ᵉ, *'al,* or *'el* to indicate the place. This construction occurs, e.g., in Gen. 1:17, with God setting the stars in *(b*ᵉ*)* the firmament; or God sets his bow in *(b*ᵉ*)* the clouds (Gen. 9:13). One places a garland on *(b*ᵉ*)* someone's head (Prov. 4:9; Est. 6:8) and bread on *('al)* the table (Ex. 25:30). One gives a woman into *(b*ᵉ*)* the embrace of a man (Gen. 16:5). The same constructions are used to say that someone wounds (*nāṯan b*ᵉ, Lev. 24:19) or slanders another person (Ps. 50:20).

The semantic proximity with verbs of "putting, placing" is also evident in numerous idiomatic expressions similarly constructed with → שִׂים *śîm,* sometimes → שִׁית *šîṯ* and *nāṯan,* as if these verbs were synonyms. A partial selection would include *śîm tiplâ* (Job 24:12) par. *nāṯan tiplâ* (Job 1:22), "ascribe unrighteousness, judge as unrighteous"; *śîm ḥōq* (Ex. 15:25; Josh. 24:25) par. *šîṯ ḥōq* (Job 14:13) par. *nāṯan ḥōq* (Ps. 99:7; 148:6; Prov. 31:15; Neh. 9:13; Ezk. 20:25), "promulgate a law"; *śîm šālôm* (Nu. 6:26; Isa. 60:17) par. *nāṯan šālôm* (Lev. 26:6; 1 Ch. 22:9; Jer. 14:13; Hag. 2:9), "create or bring about peace"; *śîm pānîm* (Gen. 31:21; Lev. 20:5; Jer. 21:10; Ezk. 6:2; 13:17; etc.) par. *nāṯan pānîm,*[5] "turn, turn around"; *śîm rûaḥ* (Isa. 63:11) par. *nāṯan rûaḥ* (Nu. 11:29; 1 K. 22:23; 2 K. 19:7; 2 Ch. 18:22; Neh. 9:20; Isa. 37:7; 42:1,5; Ezk. 11:19; 36:26f.; 37:6,14), "give breath," or "put spirit into"; *śîm dām* (Dt. 22:8; Jgs. 9:24; 1 K. 2:5; Ezk. 24:7) par. *nāṯan dām* (Dt. 21:8; 1 K. 2:5; Jer. 26:15; Ezk. 16:38; 24:8; Joel 3:3[2:30]; 11QT 63:7), "spill blood"; *śîm 'ōṯôṯ ûmōp*ᵉ*ṯîm* (Ps. 78:43; 105:27; Jer. 32:20) par. *nāṯan 'ōṯôṯ ûmōp*ᵉ*ṯîm* (Ex. 7:9; Dt. 6:22; 13:2[1]; 1 K. 13:3; 2 Ch. 32:24; Neh. 9:10; Joel 3:3[2:30]), "provide signs and wonders"; *śîm l*ᵉ*šammâ* (Isa. 13:9; Jer. 4:7; 18:16; 19:8; 25:9; 51:29; Joel 1:7; Zec. 7:14) par. *šîṯ l*ᵉ*šammâ* (Jer. 2:15; 50:3) par. *nāṯan l*ᵉ*šammâ* (2 Ch. 29:8; 30:7; Jer. 25:18; 29:18; Mic. 6:16), "make (something) a desolation"; *śîm lišrēqâ* (Jer. 19:8; 25:9) par. *nāṯan lišrēqâ* (2 Ch. 29:8; Jer. 25:18; 29:18; Mic. 6:16), "make into a laughingstock"; *śîm ḥerpâ* (1 S. 11:2; Ps. 39:9[8]; 44:14[13]) par. *nāṯan (l*ᵉ*) ḥerpâ* (Jer. 24:9; 29:18; Ezk. 5:14; 22:4; Joel 2:17,19), "put disgrace upon"; *śîm liṯhillâ ûl*ᵉ*šēm* (Zeph. 3:19) par. *nāṯan liṯhillâ ûl*ᵉ*šēm* (Dt. 26:19; Zeph. 3:20), "give praise and honor"; *śîm l*ᵉ*gôy gāḏôl* (Gen. 21:18; 46:3) par. *nāṯan l*ᵉ*gôy gāḏôl* (Gen. 17:20), "make into a great people"; *śîm raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* (Isa. 47:6) par. *nāṯan raḥ*ᵃ*mîm* (Dt. 13:18[17]; Jer. 42:12; 11QT 55:11f.; Metsadah Ḥashavyahu 13f.), "show mercy."

3. *Turn into Something.* The verb *nāṯan* is often used with the accusative and the prep. *l*ᵉ, followed by a dative object, to show that someone or something is transformed. The fundamental meaning is that of "set, put, place." In addition to the expressions already mentioned,[6] the following examples may be included: *nāṯan l*ᵉ*gôyim* (Gen. 17:6), "make nations of"; *nāṯan l*ᵉ*'ôr gôyim* (Isa. 49:6), "give as a light to the nations"; *nāṯan lizwā'â* (Jer. 15:4; 24:9; 29:18; 34:17), "make into a horror"; *nāṯan l*ᵉ*māšāl w*ᵉ*lišnînâ* (2 Ch. 7:20; Jer. 24:9), "make into a mockery and taunt"; *nāṯan*

5. See II.5 below.
6. See II.2 above.

liqlālâ (Jer. 24:9; 25:18; 26:6), "make into a curse"; *nāṯan lᵉrō'š wᵉlō' lᵉzānāḇ* (Dt. 28:13; cf. v. 44; Isa. 9:13f.[14f.]; 19:15), "make into the head and not into the tail"; *nāṯan lᵉḥōmôṯ nᵉḥōšeṯ* (Jer. 1:18; 15:20; cf. EA, 147:53), "make into a bronze wall"; *nāṯan lᵉṯip'āreṯ* (Dt. 26:19), "make into honor"; *nāṯan linwēh gᵉmallîm . . . lᵉmirbaṣ-ṣō'n* (Ezk. 25:5), "make into a pasture for camels . . . into a fold for the flocks"; *nāṯan liṣḥîaḥ sāla'* (Ezk. 26:4), "make into a bare rock"; *nāṯan lᵉḥorbôṯ* (Ezk. 29:10), "make a desolation of"; *nāṯan lᵉraḥᵃmîm* (1 K. 8:50; Ps. 106:46; Neh. 1:11; Dnl. 1:9; cf. Gen. 43:14 without *lᵉ*), "grant compassion."

Instead of *lᵉ*, the comparative particle *kᵉ* is also used: *nāṯan kᵉṯōpeṯ* (Jer. 19:12), "make like Topheth"; *nāṯan ka'ᵃḇānîm* (1 K. 10:27; 2 Ch. 1:15), "make as numerous as stones." A third possible construction uses a double accusative: *nāṯan* PN *nāḡîḏ* (1 K. 14:7; 16:2; Isa. 55:4), "elevate PN to be crown prince"; *nāṯan* PN *niḇzîm* (Mal. 2:9), "make PN despised."

4. *Allow.* The verb *nāṯan* used with *lᵉ* and the infinitive means "let" or "allow" (the fundamental meaning here being "set, put"). This syntagma generally occurs with a negation, i.e., *lō' nāṯan lᵉ* + infinitive (Gen. 20:6; 31:7; Ex. 3:19; 12:23; Jgs. 1:23; 15:1; 1 S. 18:2; 2 Ch. 20:10; Job 31:30; Ps. 16:10; 66:9; 121:3; Eccl. 5:5[6]; Hos. 5:4). The construction without *lō'* occurs more rarely, and then in relatively late texts (1 Ch. 16:7; 22:19; Est. 8:11; Job 24:23). In these texts the direct object of *nāṯan* is introduced by *lᵉ* (cf. also 2 Ch. 20:10), except in 1 Ch. 16:7, which employs a circumscription with *bᵉyaḏ*. In some texts *nāṯan* directly governs an infinitive without *lᵉ* (with *lō'* in Nu. 21:23; Job 9:18; Ps. 55:23[22]; without negation in Ex. 16:3; Nu. 20:21; 2 S. 19:1[18:33]). Two of these texts (Ex. 16:3; 2 S. 19:1[18:33]) use the expression *mî-yittēn*, which B. Jongeling and M. Z. Kaddari have examined. This expresses an (un)fulfillable wish, though the precise meaning depends on the specific nuance of the verb *nāṯan* and the construction itself.

5. *Idiomatic Usage.* The verb *nāṯan* also occurs in various idiomatic expressions, which are frequent and sometimes problematical.

The expression *nāṯan pānāw* is already attested in Mari,[7] Ugarit *(ytn pnm)*,[8] and in Amarna letters from Byblos,[9] Tyre,[10] and Jerusalem.[11] It means "turn around" or "turn," and is used in Ugaritic with *'m*, in the letters from *ARM* and EA with *ana*, in Lev. 17:10; 20:3,6; 26:17; Ezk. 14:8; 15:7 with *bᵉ*, in Gen. 30:40 and Dnl. 9:3 with *'el*, in Dnl. 10:15 with the accusative and an enclitic *-h*, and in 2 Ch. 20:3 with *lᵉ* + infinitive.

The phrase *nāṯan 'al yaḏ* means "entrust to." It occurs in Gen. 42:37; 2 K. 12:16 [15]; 22:5,7,9; 1 Ch. 29:8; 2 Ch. 34:10,17; CD 14:13. In contrast, *nāṯan 'al yaḏ* in Gen.

---

7. C.-F. Jean, ed., *Lettres diverses. ARM* II (1950), 57, 7.
8. *WUS*, no. 2230, 2.
9. EA, 73:37f.; 117:20f.
10. EA, 148:9f., 26f.; 150:4f.; 151:19f., 23f., 69f.; 155:27f.
11. EA, 286:53; 288:49f.

41:42; Ezk. 16:11; and 23:42 (mss.) means "put (a ring) on someone's hand" in the literal and material sense.

The syntagma *nāṯan yāḏ bᵉ* in Ex. 7:4; 1QM 12:11; and 19:3 has become a simple variation of *šālaḥ yāḏ bᵉ* (Gen. 37:22; 1 S. 24:7,11[6,10]; 26:9; etc.) with the meaning "lay violent hands upon a person." The original sense of this phrase was probably "go to some effort," "take in hand," like *ida nadānu* in Babylonian.[12] By contrast, *nāṯan yāḏ* with *lᵉ* (2 Ch. 30:8) or *taḥaṯ* (1 Ch. 29:24) or with *lᵉ* + infinitive (Ezr. 10:19) means "surrender (oneself)," "subject oneself to someone," or "give in to someone." Thus does Jehonadab "subject himself" to Jehu (2 K. 10:15), and the members of the Davidic court "subject themselves" to Solomon (1 Ch. 29:24). In both these cases, "giving one's hand" indicates that a person declares himself to be a vassal of the ruler, accepts the ruler, and acknowledges his authority. Ezk. 17:18 alludes in the same sense to King Zedekiah, who "had subjected himself" to Babylon by acknowledging Nebuchadnezzar as ruler (cf. 2 K. 24:17). In an analogous fashion the people are invited to "yield themselves to Yahweh" (2 Ch. 30:8). In Jer. 50:15 *nāṯᵉnâ yāḏāh* means simply that Babylon "has surrendered." The phrase *nāṯannû yāḏ* in Lam. 5:6 can be translated exactly the same: "We have subjected ourselves to Egypt and Assyria in order to eat our fill of bread." According to Ezr. 10:19, those priests who had married foreign women "give in" *(wayyittᵉnû yāḏām)* and agree to send their wives away. This syntagma also occurs in a Neo-Assyrian text, doubtlessly under the influence of a West Semitic language: *idēni ana mītūti nittidin,* "we have given in to death" (cf. Ezk. 31:14).[13] This idiomatic usage of *nāṯan yāḏ* must be distinguished from Gen. 38:28, which refers to the actual gesture of extending one's hand, and from Isa. 56:5, where *yāḏ* refers to a stela or monument (cf. 1 S. 15:12; 2 S. 18:18).[14]

One of the most frequently attested syntagmas is *nāṯan bᵉyaḏ,* meaning "deliver over," usually "to the favor or disfavor" of someone else (Gen. 9:2; Ex. 23:31; Lev. 26:25; Nu. 21:2,34; Dt. 1:27; 2:24,30; 3:2f.; 7:24; 19:12; 20:13; 21:10; Josh. 2:24; 6:2; 7:7; 8:1,7,18; 10:8,19,30,32; 11:8; 21:44; 24:8,11; Jgs. 1:2,4; 2:14,23; 3:10,28; 4:7,14; 6:1; 7:2,7,9, 14f.; 8:3,7; 9:29; 11:21,30,32; 12:3; 13:1; 15:2,12f.; 16:23f.; 18:10; 20:28; 1 S. 14:10,12, 37; 17:47; 23:4,14; 24:5,11[4,10]; 26:23; 28:19; 30:23; 2 S. 5:19; 16:8; 21:9; 1 K. 18:9; 20:13,28; 22:6,12,15; 2 K. 3:10,13,18; 13:3; 17:20; 18:30; 19:10; 21:14; 1 Ch. 5:20; 14:10; 22:18; 2 Ch. 13:16; 16:8; 18:5,11,14; 24:24; 28:5,9; 36:17; Ezr. 9:7; Neh. 9:24, 27,30; Job 9:24; Ps. 78:61; 106:41; Isa. 36:15; 37:10; 47:6; Jer. 20:4f.; 21:7,10; 22:25; 26:24; 27:6; 29:21; 32:2f.,24f.,28,36,43; 34:2f.,20f.; 37:17; 38:3,16,18f.; 39:17; 43:3; 44:30; 46:24,26; Lam. 1:14; Ezk. 7:21; 11:9; 16:39; 21:36[31]; 23:9,28; 31:11; 39:23; Dnl. 1:2; 11:11; CD 1:6; 1QpHab 4:7f.; 9:6f.,10; 11QT 62:9; 63:10).[15] The cry "Yahweh

---

12. *Altbabylonische Briefe in Umschrift und Übersetzung,* II, 130, 14; F. Thureau Dangin, "L'Exaltation d'Ištar," *RA* 11 (1914) 147, 7; cf. *CAD,* XI/1, 52.

13. R. F. Harper, *ABL,* XI, 1238, r. 18.

14. → יד *yāḏ,* V, 422f.

15. Cf. W. Richter, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch. BBB* 18 (²1966), 21ff.; J. G. Plöger, *Literarkritische, formgeschichtliche und stilkritische Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium. BBB* 26 (1967), 61ff.

has given . . . into your hands" belongs to the language of holy war. On the basis of an affirmative divine decision, the leader proclaimed this before the battle.[16] The same expression can also contain the idea of mediation or of services rendered, meaning then "give something over to someone" (Gen. 27:17; 30:35; 32:17[16]; 39:4,8,22; Ex. 10:25; 2 S. 10:10; 1 K. 15:18; 1 Ch. 19:11; 2 Ch. 34:16; Ps. 10:14; Isa. 22:21; Arad ostracon 17:8f.). The idiomatic sense of *beyaḏ* as "through the mediation of" becomes clear in Lev. 26:46 and Neh. 10:30(29), where *nāṯan beyaḏ mōšeh* must be translated "give through the mediation of Moses." In some texts *nāṯan beyaḏ* must be understood in the material sense of "hand over," almost with the nuance "by one's own hand." This is the case in the passages referring to a cup (Gen. 40:13; Ezk. 23:31), trumpets and jars (Jgs. 7:16), a sword (Ex. 5:21; Ezk. 21:16[11]; 30:24), or a bill of divorce (Dt. 24:1,3).

The expression *nāṯan libbô*[17] with *le* followed by an infinitive occurs only in extremely late texts (1 Ch. 22:19; 2 Ch. 11:16; Eccl. 1:13,17; 8:16; Dnl. 10:12). This expression (occurring also with *šîṯ*, Prov. 22:17) means "devote oneself to" or "get to work on," and should not be confused with the similar expression *nāṯan libbô le* with a dative object (Eccl. 7:21; 8:9), "pay attention to, apply one's mind to," synonymous with *šîṯ libbô le* (2 S. 13:20; Ps. 48:14[13]; Prov. 27:23; Jer. 31:21; cf. 1 S. 4:20; Ps. 62:11[10]) or *'el* (Job 7:17), with *śîm libbô le* (Dt. 32:46; 1 S. 9:20; Ezk. 40:4; cf. Ezk. 44:5) or *'el* (Ex. 9:21; 1 S. 25:25; 2 S. 18:3; Job 2:3; 34:14), or also *'al* (Job 1:8; Hag. 1:5,7; cf. Hag. 2:15,18; Zec. 7:12). The analogous expression *nāṯan rō'š* with *le* + infinitive (Neh. 9:17; cf. Nu. 14:4) means "decide" to do something.

III. Legal and Commercial Usage.

1. *Compensation.* The verb *nāṯan* is frequently used in the juridical sphere, where it exhibits a variety of meanings. In the Covenant Code (Ex. 21:19,22), *nāṯan* has the sense of "pay" (cf. 21:32: *nāṯan kesep*), or, better, "compensate." The legal regulations in Ex. 21 address on the one hand fights that result in one of the adversaries becoming bedridden or invalid (vv. 18f.), and on the other hand a miscarriage caused when a woman is harmed by one of the combatants (v. 22). In both cases it is impossible to return things to their original condition, or to repair the damage by providing the wronged person with an equivalent *in natura.* The lawgiver here does not use the verb *šillēm,* which is used consistently in 21:33–22:14(15) in the sense of "restore." The condition of being an invalid on the one hand, and the loss of a fetus on the other, cannot be directly restored. Hence the invalid and the husband of the woman miscarrying must receive a sum of money or natural goods as compensation for the irreparable consequences of the violence. In the case of the crippled person, the one who has struck him must *šiḇtô yittēn,* "pay (or compensate) his lameness" (21:19). In the case of the pregnant woman, the perpetrator is to bow to the demands of the wronged husband *wenāṯan biplilîm,* "and pay" or "provide compensation for the misdeed." The same interpretation is required in 4Q158 9:5, where *bplylyym* should be understood as an ab-

16. Cf. G. von Rad, *Holy War in Ancient Israel* (Eng. trans., Grand Rapids, 1991), 42.
17. → לב *lēḇ* (VII, 399-437).

stract plural of *p*ᵉ*lîlî* (cf. Job 31:11,28).[18] The *b*ᵉ in *bplylyym* is a *b*ᵉ *pretii*, and is frequently associated with *nāṯan*.

The verb *nāṯan* is also used with the prep. *taḥaṯ* in formulating the lex talionis (Ex. 21:23-25; cf. Dt. 19:21). This indicates that in such cases *nāṯan* connotes "give up, sacrifice": "And if any harm follows, then you shall give life for life, eye for eye, etc." The lawgiver here is doubtlessly demanding compensation that restores the balance between the wronged family and that of the perpetrator.

2. *Remuneration for Work*. Payment for work or service is also designated by *nāṯan*. The direct object is then *śāḵār* (Gen. 30:18,28; Ex. 2:9; Dt. 24:15; 1 K. 5:20[6]; Jon. 1:3; cf. Zec. 11:12 *yhb*), "wages," "fees," which sometimes is not explicitly mentioned (Gen. 30:31), though also *p*ᵉ*'ullâ* (Isa. 61:8), "recompense, remuneration," "wages," or quite simply *kesep* (Jgs. 16:5; 17:10; 2 S. 18:11), "money." Such work or service can include watching over a flock (Gen. 30:28,31; cf. Zec. 11:12), committing an act of betrayal (Jgs. 16:5), fulfilling priestly functions (Jgs. 17:10), murdering an enemy (2 S. 18:11), nursing an infant (Ex. 2:9), felling trees (1 K. 5:20[6]), and transporting someone by ship (Jon. 1:3).

The wages for hired labor can also be designated by *mattaṯ*. This is the case in Prov. 25:14, where one should perhaps read *mattaṯ śāḵîr* (instead of *šeqer*) and translate "so is a man who boasts of paying wages," an allusion to the meager wages earned by hired labor. The expression *nāṯan mattaṯ* in 1 K. 13:7 similarly means "pay wages," in this case those of the healer (1 K. 13:6). An analogous case is found in Gen. 20:14,16-18, where Abimelech gives Abraham sheep and money, apparently so that through Abraham's intercession he and the women of his harem, all of whom were struck with infertility, might be healed. The expression *nāṯan kesep* (Gen. 20:16) often means "pay" (Gen. 23:13; Ex. 21:32; Jgs. 16:5; 17:10; 2 S. 18:11; 1 K. 21:2). The *mattānôṯ*, "gifts," can also refer to presents or sums of money given to someone to insure his assistance (Prov. 15:27; Eccl. 7:7). Wages for sacral prostitution are given a specific name: *'eṯnâ* (Hos. 2:14[12]) or *'eṯnan* (Dt. 23:19[18]; Ezk. 16:31,34,41), an expression the prophets also apply metaphorically to Israel (Hos. 9:1), Samaria (Mic. 1:7), and Tyre (Isa. 23:17f.). The prostitute asked her client *mâ-titten-lî*, "what will you give me?" (Gen. 38:16), and she "had him paid" (Hos. 8:9f.; denominated hiphil **hiṯin*, attested once, and only in this context).[19]

3. *Sale*. In contractual and commercial law, *nāṯan* can mean "sell." Although this meaning is certainly included in the syntagma *nāṯan b*ᵉ*ḵesep* (Gen. 23:9b; Dt. 2:28; 14:25; 1 K. 21:6,15; 1 Ch. 21:22; Ezk. 27:12), "give for money," *nāṯan* alone can also have this meaning. This is particularly the case in the narrative of the patriarch's purchase of the burying place in Hebron (Gen. 23:4,9a,11).[20] This emerges clearly from

---

18. Cf. *GK*, §124f.

19. On the hiphil see I.2 above.

20. Cf. H. Petschow, "Die neubabylonische Zwiegesprächsurkunde und Genesis 23," *JCS* 19 (1965) 103-20.

the context, since not only does the process take place *l^e'ênê ḇ^{e}nê 'ammî,* i.e., in the presence of witnesses (Gen. 23:11), but the narrative also goes on to report the discussion concerning the price of the field (vv. 12-16) and the payment of the sum agreed on (v. 16). The verb *nāṯan* is already attested with this meaning in the ancient episode in Jgs. 8:5f. This becomes clear in the response of the officials of Succoth, who fear they will not be paid and ask mockingly whether the cup *(kap),* i.e., the fate (cf. Ps. 11:6; 16:5), of the Midianites is already in Gideon's hand. A third passage attesting *nāṯan* in the sense of "sell" (1 K. 9:11b-14) uses the verb 3 times with this meaning. The twenty cities ceded to Hiram are not given to him as a present but rather are sold for a price of 120 talents of gold, which the king of Tyre sends to Solomon (1 K. 9:14). This notion of "selling" or "exchanging" also occurs in 1 K. 21:2-4,6, not only in vv. 6 and 15 in the expression *nāṯan b^{e}ḵesep;* v. 2 already makes clear that Ahab wishes to acquire Naboth's vineyard by trading it for a better one or by buying it at its value. If *nāṯan b^{e}ḵesep* means "sell," then correspondingly *nāṯan kesep b^e* means "buy" (Dt. 14:26).

4. *Exchange.* The verb *nāṯan* is also used with *b^e pretii* when the intended meaning is "exchange"; this qualification, signaled by the preposition, enables one to distinguish between sale and exchange (1 K. 21). According to Lam. 1:11, the people, in their search for bread, "trade *(nāṯan)* their treasures for food *(b^e'ōḵel).*" Joel 4:3(3:3) mentions the interlopers who traded *(nāṯan)* young boys for harlots *(bazzônâ).* An analogous notion is found in the Phoenician inscription of Kilamuwa, which alleges that the Assyrian king "gave a maid for a lamb, a man for a garment" *('lmt ytn bš wgbr bswt).*[21]

Ezk. 27:12-22 recalls the practice of barter in the international trade carried on by Tyre; here the syntagma *nāṯan b^e* appears in the sense of "exchange for." In 3 instances here the direct object of *nāṯan* is **'izz^{e}ḇônîm* (27:12,14,22), twice also introduced by *b^e pretii* (vv. 16,19; cf. also vv. 27,33). This is probably an expression borrowed from the Phoenician (cf. Ugar. *'db,* "prepare"; OSA *'ḏb,* "set up"),[22] referring to manufactured goods, which are exchanged for raw materials, specialty foods, valuable fabrics, precious stones, slaves, or livestock. In the same text the word *ma'^{a}rāḇ,* which as in Aramaic refers to a ship's cargo,[23] is twice the direct object of *nāṯan* (Ezk. 27:13,17), and is introduced once by *b^e pretii* (v. 19; cf. also vv. 9,25,27,33f.).

The notion of exchange is also associated with *nāṯan* in 1 K. 10:10,13, verses that in the original narrative appeared in direct succession. The correspondence of gifts between the queen of Sheba and King Solomon in reality constitutes an exchange of the sort commonly practiced among kings at the international level;[24] cf. also 1 K. 5:24f.(10f.), where Hiram supplies *(hāyâ nōṯēn)* Solomon with cedar and cypress wood in exchange for 20,000 *kōr* of wheat and 20,000 *baṯ* (LXX) of olive oil yearly.

The metaphor of exchange occurs in Cant. 8:7 and Job 2:4. The aphorism in Cant.

---

21. *KAI,* 24:8; *ANET,* 654.
22. Beeston, 12f.
23. *AP,* 2:5.
24. Zaccagnini, 117-24.

8:7 mentions the man who "gives all the wealth of his house for love *(bā'ahᵃḇâ)*" (without attaining it); and in Job 2:4 Satan asserts that a person will give everything that belongs to him "for his life *(bᵉ'aḏ napšô)*." The compound prep. *b'd* here is nothing other than an amplified *bᵉ pretii.*

5. *Loan.* The verb *nāṯan* is also used with *bᵉ pretii* in the phrases *nāṯan bᵉnešeḵ* (Lev. 25:37; Ps. 15:5; Ezk. 18:8,13)[25] and *nāṯan bᵉmarbîṯ* (Lev. 25:37), both of which mean "loan at interest." The word → נשך *nešeḵ* refers to a contract that fixes the sum to be repaid, whereby the interest due on the date of payment is already figured in. In contrast, *marbîṯ* or *tarbîṯ* fixes the amount of capital loaned out and the rate of interest.[26] The direct object of *nāṯan* in the phrase *nāṯan bᵉnešeḵ* (Lev. 25:37; Ps. 15:5) is *kesep,* "money," and in *nāṯan bᵉmarbîṯ* (Lev. 25:37) *'ōḵel,* "grain." Since money and grain are the commodities most frequently loaned, however, one should not conclude from the ancient legal maxim in Lev. 25:37 in poetic form that the object of a *nešeḵ* loan was primarily money and that of a *tarbîṯ/marbîṯ* loan primarily grain (specifically barley).

6. *Wedding Contract.* The expression *nāṯan bittô lᵉ'iššâ lᵉ*PN, "he gave his daughter as a wife to PN," derives similarly from the terminology of contractual law (Gen. 16:3; 29:28; 30:4,9; 34:8,12; 38:14; 41:45; Dt. 22:16; Josh. 15:16f.; Jgs. 1:12f.; 21:1; 1 S. 18:17,19,27; 1 K. 2:17,21; 2 K. 14:9; 1 Ch. 2:35; 2 Ch. 25:18; cf. Gen. 29:19,27; 34:9,16,21; Ex. 22:16[17]; Dt. 7:3; Jgs. 3:6; 1 S. 17:25; Ezr. 9:12; Neh. 10:31[30]; 13:25; Jer. 29:6; Dnl. 11:17). Even if the marriage was not viewed as a purchase, the family of the bride nonetheless had a right to expect financial compensation (Gen. 34:12; Ex. 22:15f.[14f.]; 1 S. 18:25),[27] which might also take the form of services rendered (Gen. 29:15-30; Josh. 15:16f.; Jgs. 1:12f.; 1 S. 18:17-27; cf. 1 S. 17:25; 2 S. 3:14).

In the narrative of the two marriages of Jacob, Laban is to give him his daughter (Gen. 29:19) as a reward *(maśkōreṯ,* 29:15; cf. 31:7,41; Ruth 2:12) for services rendered. At the end of seven years, when Jacob objects to Laban's deception, Laban promises also to give him the younger daughter "for the work" *(ba'ᵃḇōḏâ)* he will perform for him in seven additional years (Gen. 29:27). The *bᵉ* in *ba'ᵃḇōḏâ* is a *bᵉ pretii,* and is part of the full formula of the wedding contract: *nāṯan bittô lᵉ*PN *lᵉ'iššâ ba'ᵃḇōḏâ/bᵉmōhar (habbᵉṯûlôṯ)* (1 S. 18:25; cf. Ex. 22:16[17]) */bᵉmē'â 'ōrlôṯ pᵉlištîm* (1 S. 18:25; 2 S. 3:14).

In addition to the *mōhar* or its equivalent, we encounter in *mattān* another "gift" *ex marito* (mentioned in Gen. 34:12 after *mōhar*). This is presumably an equivalent to Akk. *nudunnû,* which was a kind of dowry (morning gift) or widow's settlement.[28] It is uncertain whether Gen. 24:53a refers to this *mattān,* since the jewelry offered to

---

25. Cf. *KTU,* 4.682, 3f., 12.

26. E. Lipiński, "*Nešek* and *tarbīt* in the Light of Epigraphic Evidence," *OLP* 10 (1979) 133-41.

27. → מהר *mōhar* (VIII, 142-49).

28. Cf. *AHw,* II, 800b; *CAD,* XI/2, 310.

Rebekah more likely corresponds to the *dumāqū* of Middle Assyrian laws.[29] Such jewelry was intended to adorn the bride (cf. Isa. 61:10) and was given over to her to use only during the marriage. In contrast, the *migdānôṯ* given to Rebekah's brothers and mother could be *mōhar* (Gen. 24:53b). The latter, like the widow's settlement and the groom's present, must be distinguished from the *šillûḥîm,* which the father gives to his daughter as a dowry (*nāṯan,* 1 K. 9:16; cf. Mic. 1:14), and which in the case of divorce he can take back (Ex. 18:2, *'aḥar šillûḥeyhā,* "in addition to her dowry").

7. *Gifts.* The Priestly texts in the Pentateuch express the notion of promise and bequest of the land through formulas derived from deeds of gift. A comparison of the expressions used in Gen. 12:7; 13:15,17; 15:18; 17:8; 24:7 with that in 48:4 (cf. Dt. 1:8; Nu. 32:29; 1QS 11:7) yields the following reconstructed formula: *nāṯattî lᵉḵā ûlᵉ-zarʿᵃḵā 'aḥᵃreyḵā 'eṯ-(kol-)hā'āreṣ hazzō'ṯ (la)'ᵃḥuzzaṯ 'ôlām/'aḏ 'ôlām,* "to you and to your descendants after you I will give this (entire) land for an everlasting possession/ forever." The actual Priestly influence appears only in the usage of *zarʿᵃḵā* instead of *bāneyḵā,* which occurs in Dt. 1:36 and in attested legal procedure. This formula is in fact a parallel to that found in Aramaic deeds of gifts from Elephantine: "This house and land I give to you *(yhbth)* for my lifetime and after my death; you have full rights over it from this day for ever, and your children after you."[30] A similar formula appears in a deed of gift from Naḥal Ḥever: "as a free gift, I, Simeon, give *(yhbt)* to you, Miriam, all that I possess in Maḥoza . . . ; I give [it] *(yhbt)* to you as a gift in perpetuity *(mtnt 'lm).*"[31] The specification "as a free gift" occurs frequently in the Aramaic documents: *brḥmn,*[32] *brḥmh,*[33] *rḥmt,*[34] or *mn r'wty.*[35] But such formulations have no equivalent in the Priestly texts regarding the giving of the land.

Gen. 13:14f.,17 show that the giving of the land to Abraham has immediate legal status. The passage in question is actually alluding to the double rite of taking possession of the land, namely, to the circumspection and circumlocution of the entire area.[36] 1QapGen is particularly interested in the execution of this rite by Abraham, who traverses the promised land (21:8-20), as described in Gen. 15:18. A variation in Ex. 32:13(12), where *wᵉnāḥᵃlû lᵉ'ôlām* is used instead of *la'ᵃḥuzzaṯ 'ôlām* (Gen. 17:8; 48:4), shows that the Priestly authors borrowed their formula from deeds of gift *mortis causa.* In such deeds, a paterfamilias bequeaths, prior to his own death, an inheritance to one or several of his descendants (cf. Ezk. 46:16). Here the Priestly authors remain loyal to an older tradition also attested in Deuteronomy, where one repeatedly encoun-

29. Pl. A, §§25, 26, 38.
30. *AP,* 8:8f.; cf. 13:7f.; 25:8f.; *BMAP,* 4:4f.
31. Y. Yadin, "Expedition D — The Cave of Letters," *IEJ* 12 (1962) 241ff.
32. *AP,* 18:2; 25:11, 14; 43:3; *BMAP,* 4:4, 12; 7:41; 9:5, 12, 16f.; 10:9.
33. *BMAP,* 6:14.
34. *AP,* 9:6f.; *BMAP,* 12:26, 31.
35. See pap?ḤevB ar 3.
36. Cf. D. Daube, *Studies in Biblical Law* (Cambridge, 1947), 25-39.

ters the expression *hā'āreṣ 'ašer YHWH 'elōheyḵā nōṯēn leḵā naḥalâ,* "the land that Yahweh your God gives you for an inheritance" (Dt. 4:21; 15:4; 19:10; 21:23; 24:4; 25:19; 26:1; cf. 3:18; 4:38; 20:16; 29:7[8]; Josh. 11:23).

The giving of land has a counterpart in Gen. 17:7f.; the bequest of the land, which is the object of the covenant (cf. Ex. 6:4), is bound to the obligation to acknowledge Yahweh as God: *lihyôṯ leḵā lē'lōhîm* (Gen. 17:7; Lev. 22:33; 25:38; 26:45; cf. Gen. 17:8). The question is whether this expression does not derive originally from the formula of bequest *mortis causa,* as might be suggested by Gen. 17:18 and Lev. 25:38. If one considers that 1 S. 28:13 refers to the spirit of the deceased as *'elōhîm* (doubtlessly a reference to the cult of the dead),[37] then it is possible that *lihyôṯ leḵā lē'lōhîm* originally contained an obligation directed to the recipient to provide for the interment of the donor after death. In the meantime, it is certain that the Priestly authors applied this expression to the cult of Yahweh, who had just bequeathed the land; it is thus to be expected that the recipients, namely, Abraham and his descendants, would provide for Yahweh's cult. Thus although this gift made in perpetuity did not become a qualified bequest, it did imply obligations that the recipient had over against the donor. In this case such obligations involved loyalty to the conditions of the covenant, conditions God fixes through the bequest. This view of covenant and the bequest of the land is reflected in the LXX translation of *berîṯ* by *diathḗkē,* which can refer both to an act of bequest *mortis causa* as well as to a testament or will in the usual sense. From this one may conclude that an uninterrupted tradition linked the Greek translation with the Priestly authors of the Pentateuch.

A bequest during the lifetime of the donor (outside the covenantal context) occurs in Gen. 25:6. Abraham "gives gifts" *(nāṯan mattānôṯ)* to the sons of his concubines *(pîlagšîm).*[38] The text specifies that he did this "while he was still living" *(be'ôḏennû ḥay),* and that he sent them away "to the detriment of" *(mē'al;* cf. Jgs. 16:19f.) his heir Isaac. At issue is a bequest of movable goods to which Abraham's natural sons would have had no claim after his death. The same expression, *nāṯan mattānâ,* appears twice in Ezk. 46:16f. A *mattānâ* that a prince gives to one of his sons is to be viewed as an advance on that son's inheritance *(naḥalâ).* By contrast, a *mattānâ* given to a prince's servant does not become that servant's property. According to 2 Ch. 21:3, the *mattānôṯ* are gifts of movable and immovable goods the king offers to his younger sons, while to the firstborn, Jehoram, he gives the kingdom itself. It thus seems that the expression *nāṯan mattānâ* everywhere refers to anticipatory gifts from an inheritance involving also an apportionment of the estate. In contrast, the semantic scope of *mattānâ* itself is broader; the *nôṯēn mattānôṯ* (Sir. 3:17) seems to be simply a generous person, unless the issue is that his generosity extends so far as to include giving away parts of his inheritance.

---

37. Cf. *KTU,* 1.17, I, 26-33; II, 1-8, 16-23.

38. Cf. J. P. Brown, "Literary Contexts of the Common Hebrew-Greek Vocabulary," *JSS* 13 (1968) 166-69.

IV. Cultic Usage.

1. *Sacrifice.* The use of *nāṯan* in the cultic sphere in the sense of "consecrate" or "sacrifice" is extremely old, though the exact meaning depends on the specific situation in which it occurs. In 1 S. 1:11 Hannah vows to "give" her child to Yahweh for his entire life if God will but send her a son. The meaning here is governed by the reciprocal nature of the process. If God "will give an offspring" (*nāṯan zera'*; cf. Gen. 15:3; 38:9), then the mother will "give" him to Yahweh. Hence the syntagma *nāṯan l^eYHWH* is detached here from its technical meaning, something also indicated by the parallelism with the double use of *šā'al* in vv. 26f. (cf. vv. 17,20; 2:20). The ritualistic formula of Hannah's vow is more likely *môrâ lō' ya^aleh 'al-rō'šô* (1 S. 1:11), "no razor shall touch his head," which is identical with the formula in Jgs. 13:5 (cf. 16:17) and synonymous with *ta'ar lō'-ya^aḇōr 'al-rō'šô* (Nu. 6:5). This is a reference to the Nazirites, with which, however, the rest of the narrative and the consecration of an offspring to God exhibit no visible connection.

This is not the case with *nāṯan l^eYHWH* in the sacrificial regulation found in Ex. 22:28b,29b(29b,30b): *b^ekôr bāneyḵā titten-lî*, "the firstborn of your sons you shall give to me . . . seven days he shall be with his mother; on the eighth day you shall give him to me." Such a gift to the deity is normally a sacrifice; compare the ritualistic text from Ugarit: *ytn š qdš[]*, "he shall give a sheep as a holy sacrificial gift,"[39] or the Phoenician inscription from Lapethos: *ytt wyqdšt ḥyt šgyt . . . l'dn 'š ly lmlqrt*, "I have given many animals to my Lord Melqart and consecrated them."[40] The case cited from 1 S. 1:11 as well as the consecration of the *n^eṯînîm* (see below) show in addition that an interpretation deviating from the ancient law in Ex. 22:28f.(29f.) was possible. One presumably gave the law an interpretation acceptable at a later time, or presupposed the usual redeeming of the firstlings (cf. 13:12f.; 34:19f.), though the texts say nothing of this. Several passages show unequivocally that for the original lawgiver of 22:28b,29b(29b,30b), the term *nāṯan* included the notion of offering and sacrifice: the tradition of the death of Egypt's firstborn (11:5; 12:12,29f.; Ps. 78:51; 105:36; 135:8; 136:10); the sacrifice of the male firstborn of the clean animals (Ex. 13:15b; Nu. 18:17; Dt. 15:19-21), which is connected with that of the male firstborn; the obligation of redeeming the firstlings (Ex. 13:13b; 34:20b; Nu. 18:15); and the choice between redeeming and slaughtering the firstborn of the ass (Ex. 34:20) unsuitable for sacrifice. The same applies to the expressions *qaddeš-lî* (Ex. 13:2a; cf. Nu. 3:13), *yaqrîḇû l^eYHWH* (Nu. 18:15), *zāḇaḥ l^e* (Ps. 106:37f.), and *kol-peṭer reḥem lî* (Ex. 34:19a; cf. 13:12b), summarized succinctly as *lî hû'* in 13:2b. This is corroborated by the formulation of Jephthah's vow, who promises to sacrifice to Yahweh the first person who greets him upon his return: *w^ehā'â l^eYHWH*, "that person will be Yahweh's" (Jgs. 11:31; cf. Nu. 3:12f.).

We encounter yet another use of *nāṯan* in the sacral context in Lev. 20:2-4 and 1 Ch. 21:23. In 1 Ch. 21:23 the Chronicler has replaced the pregnant formula *habbāqār lā'ōlâ* from 2 S. 24:22 with *nāṯattî habbāqār lā'ōlâ*, "I give oxen for burnt offerings."

---

39. *KTU*, 1.104, 12; cf. 1.119, 6.
40. *KAI*, 43:9.

The same syntactical construction occurs 3 times in Lev. 20:2-4, a section possibly appended by the Priestly redactor: *nāṯan mizzarʿô lammōleḵ,* "give one of his offspring for the *mōleḵ* sacrifice." In Lev. 20:5 a later redactor who no longer knew the meaning of the word *mlk* and understood *ntn lmlk* in the same sense as *ntn lYHWH* added the gloss *lizᵉnôṯ ʾaḥᵃrê hammōleḵ.* The expression *ntn (m)zrʿw lmlk,* characterized by the Priestly use of *zrʿ* in the sense of "offspring,"[41] was in any case not an authentic formula of the *mōleḵ* ritual. This formula rather took the form *heʿᵉḇîr bᵉnô/bittô (bāʾēš) lammōleḵ* (Lev. 18:21; 2 K. 23:10; Jer. 32:35) or *heʿᵉḇîr bᵉnô/bittô bāʾēš* (Dt. 18:10; 2 K. 16:3; 17:17; 21:6; 23:10; 2 Ch. 28:3[LXX, Syr.]; 33:6; Ezk. 20:31; 23:37[LXX, Syr.]; cf. Nu. 31:23). One can also reconstruct the formula *heʿᵉḇîr kol-peṭer-reḥem (lammōleḵ)* (Ex. 13:12; Ezk. 20:26, where *lmlk* was read as *lmʿn*), referring to the sacrifice of the firstborn.

Deriving from a context different from its present one, Lev. 18:21 combines the Priestly expression *ntn mzrʿw lmlk* with the ritualistic formula *hʿbyr lmlk,* yielding *mizzarʿᵃḵā lōʾ-tittēn lᵉhaʿᵃḇîr lammōleḵ,* "you shall not give any of your offspring to devote them by fire to Molech"; cf. the similar passage Ezk. 20:26,31, where *mattānâ* replaces the verb *nāṯan.* In two parallel sentences, *waʾᵃṭammēʾ ʾôṯām bᵉmattᵉnôṯām* par. *bᵉhaʿᵃḇîr . . . lammōleḵ ʾōšimēm* (instead of *lᵉmaʿan ʾᵃšimmēm;* cf. Ps. 5:11),[42] Ezk. 20:26 explains why God gave the people the offensive laws: "that I might defile them through their gifts and through the offering of all firstborn by fire to Molech." A similar parallelism occurs in v. 31, where it is clear that *mattānâ* refers to the sacrifice of the firstborn or of children in general. Hence the term *nāṯan* is attested in the terminology of the *mōleḵ* sacrifice at least since the beginning of the 6th century, though it is possible that a contamination of two different formulae already took place in that epoch: one, a formula for the sacrifice of the male firstborn, taking the form *nāṯan bᵉḵôr bānîm/kol-peṭer-reḥem lᵉYHWH* (Ex. 22:28b,29b[29b,30b]; 13:12); the other a formula for the sacrificial consecration of a son or daughter, whose full form seems to have been *heʿᵉḇîr bᵉnô/bittô bāʾēš lammōleḵ.* In the first formula *nāṯan* can be replaced by *qdš* in the piel (Ex. 13:2a) or hiphil (Nu. 3:13).[43] According to Nu. 18:15, *nāṯan lᵉYHWH* can also be replaced by the sacrificial formula *hiqrîḇ lᵉYHWH* (cf. Lev. 1:2; Ezr. 8:35; Ezk. 46:4, etc.).

The expression *nāṯan rêaḥ nîḥōaḥ* (Ezk. 6:13), lit. "give off pleasing odor,"[44] derives from the context of burnt offering (cf. Gen. 8:20f.; Ex. 29:18,25; Nu. 15:3, etc.). Ezk. 20:28 uses the verb *śîm* instead of *nāṯan,*[45] although the latter is yet used with *rêaḥ* as the direct object in Cant. 1:12; 2:13; 7:14[13]). The verb *nāṯan* also occurs in the expressions *nāṯan tᵉrûmaṯ YHWH* (Ex. 30:14f.; Nu. 18:28; 2 Ch. 31:14),[46] and

---

41. Cf. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 273 n. 6.
42. Cf. *GK,* §68.
43. Concerning the parallelism between *qdš* and *ntn* cf. 1 K. 9:7; 2 Ch. 7:20; Neh. 12:47; Jer. 1:5; *KAI,* 43:9.
44. Cf. II.1 above.
45. Cf. II.2 above.
46. Cf. W. von Soden, "Mirjām-Maria (Gottes-Geschenk)," *UF* 2 (1970) 269-70.

nāṯan tᵉrûmâ lᵉYHWH (Nu. 15:21; cf. 18:19). This combination with *tᵉrûmâ*, "contribution, offering (something lifted off, separated)," occurs less frequently than those with the equivalent verbs *hērîm* (Ex. 35:24; Nu. 15:19; 18:19,26,28f.; Ezk. 45:1; 48:20) and *hēḇî'* (Ex. 35:5,21,24; Dt. 12:6,11; 2 Ch. 31:10,12; Neh. 10:40[39]).

2. *Consecratory Offerings*. Some texts invite one to "give Yahweh *kāḇôḏ*" (in addition to *nāṯan* [1 S. 6:5; Jer. 13:16] one also encounters here *yāhaḇ* [1 Ch. 16:28f.; Ps. 29:1f.; 96:7f.][47] and *śîm* [Josh. 7:19; Isa. 42:12]), to "give Yahweh *tôḏâ*" (Josh. 7:19; Ezr. 10:11), to "give him *'ōz*" (Ps. 68:35[34]; cf. 1 Ch. 16:28; Ps. 29:1; 96:7), and to "give his name *kāḇôḏ*" (Mal. 2:2). The psalmist invites Yahweh himself to "give *kāḇôḏ* to his name" (Ps. 115:1), and Yahweh in his own turn assures that he will "give his *kāḇôḏ* to no other" (Isa. 42:8; 48:11). He also "gives" to Solomon "riches (possessions), *kāḇôḏ*" (1 K. 3:13; 2 Ch. 1:12; cf. also Eccl. 6:2). To those who walk uprightly he "gives" favor and *kāḇôḏ* (Ps. 84:12[11]). By contrast, the wise person proclaims that it is useless to "give *kāḇôḏ* to a fool" (Prov. 26:8).

All these texts use the verb *nāṯan*, which as a rule is associated with the notion of a transfer of goods. Hence the expression *nāṯan kāḇôḏ*, always without the article, originated at a time during the semantic evolution of → כבוד *kāḇôḏ* when this term referred to a "sum" or "totality," as in the administrative and commercial documents from Ugarit.[48] Concerning *kāḇôḏ* in the sense of "total possessions," cf. Gen. 31:1; Ps. 49:17(16); Isa. 10:3; Nah. 2:10(9). "Giving Yahweh *kāḇôḏ*" thus means that one subjects oneself completely to his will and acknowledges him as Lord.

The primary sense of this expression was perhaps quite concrete, implying a gift of all relevant possessions to the temple or their consecration to God through burnt offering. This explanation seems corroborated by the narratives in Josh. 7:19-25 and 1 S. 6:2-15. According to the original intent of these narratives, all the riches that Achan had taken, and the box with the golden objects that the Philistines wanted to offer as a guilt offering, were added to Yahweh's treasury (Josh. 6:19,24; 7:23; 1 S. 6:8,11). A comparison between Josh. 7:19 and Ezr. 10:11 also shows that the unmasked perpetrator must "give Yahweh *tôḏâ*." The expression *nāṯan tôḏâ* is likely synonymous with *hēḇî' tôḏâ* (2 Ch. 29:31; Jer. 17:26; 33:11) and *qiṭṭēr tôḏâ* (Am. 4:5), referring probably to a thanksgiving offering; in the present instance this offering gives thanks that God has exposed the source of evil. The two sentences *śîm-nā' kāḇôḏ lᵉYHWH . . . wᵉṯen-lô tôḏâ* (Josh. 7:19) are by no means inviting the perpetrator to sing a song of praise, but rather are demanding that he give everything over to Yahweh and offer him a sacrifice (cf. Ps. 50:23a). One would need to inquire whether this double rite does not derive ultimately from the tradition of holy war. Here, too, the spoils seized from the enemy are added to Yahweh's treasury, and as thanks for the victory one sacrifices to Yahweh the small livestock taken as spoil.

---

47. Cf. 3 Apoc. Bar. 2:17f.

48. M. Liverani, "*kbd* nei testi amministrativi ugaritici ['consistenza complessiva']," *UF* 2 (1970) 89-108.

This explanation finds support in 1 S. 15:15,21, despite Samuel's own condemnation in v. 22 (cf. also 1 S. 6:14).

In the course of its semantic development, *kāḇôḏ* was associated with the notion of "wealth"; cf. *nāṯan kāḇôḏ* in 1 K. 3:13; 2 Ch. 1:12; Ps. 84:12(11); Prov. 26:8; Eccl. 6:2. In contrast, in Ezk. 39:21 the expression is intended in the specific meaning given it by Ezekiel and the Priestly tradition; *wᵉnāṯattî 'eṯ-kᵉḇôḏî baggôyim* thus means "and I will set my glory among the nations."

According to Ps. 84:12(11), God "gives" *ḥēn wᵉkāḇôḏ.* The term *ḥēn* is the direct object of *nāṯan* in Gen. 39:21; Ex. 3:21; 11:3; 12:36; Ps. 84:12(11); Prov. 3:34; 13:15, suggesting that at times *ḥēn* has a relatively concrete meaning. Indeed, the *'eḇen ḥēn* (Prov. 17:8) is a "valuable stone," and the *liwyaṯ ḥēn* (Prov. 1:9; 4:9) "a fair garland." The expression *nāṯan ḥēn* probably means "to make precious," a meaning rendering the maxims in Prov. 3:34 and 13:15 more comprehensible.

The expression *nāṯan kāḇôḏ lᵉYHWH* is related to *nāṯan rē'šîṯ lᵉYHWH,* "give to Yahweh the first/best" (Nu. 18:12; Dt. 18:4; Ezk. 44:30; cf. Nu. 15:21), a formula in which *nāṯan* can be replaced by *hēḇî'* (Ex. 23:19; 34:26; Dt. 26:10; Neh. 10:38[37]); cf. also *nāṯan ma'ᵃśēr,* "pay a tenth" (Gen. 14:20; Nu. 18:21,24; Neh. 13:5), though this is more commonly expressed with *hēḇî'* (Dt. 12:6,11; 2 Ch. 31:5f.,12; Neh. 10:38[37]; 13:12; Am. 4:4; Mal. 3:10). The firstlings and the tenth belong to the *mattᵉnôṯ qoḏāšîm,* "holy gifts" (Ex. 28:38), or simply *mattānôṯ* (Lev. 23:38; Nu. 18:29) or *mattān* (Nu. 18:11), which one brings to the temple.

3. *Consecration of Slaves.* The Solomonic temple doubtlessly had slaves at its disposal, slaves that Ps. 68:19(18) calls *mattānôṯ*. The *nᵉṯînîm* (LXX *nathinaíoi, nathinim,* or *nathinin*), however, are found only in the postexilic temple. The expression is translated literally in 1 Ch. 9:2 as *hoi dedómenoi,* "the given ones," and Josephus correctly indicates their function with *hieródouloi,*[49] as does 3 Ezr. 1:3, where the Greek term preserves its original sense of "temple slave."

The *nᵉṯînîm* came from Babylon (Ezr. 2:43-54; 8:17,20; Neh. 7:46-56) and were counted among the "sons of Solomon's servants." Together they constituted a group of 392 persons (Ezr. 2:58; Neh. 7:60). These "given ones" resided on Ophel near the temple (Neh. 3:26,31; 11:21; cf. 1 Ch. 9:2; Ezr. 2:70; Neh. 7:63) and constituted the lowest group of sanctuary personnel, serving the Levites (Ezr. 8:20); their names betray in part foreign origin (Ezr. 2:43-54; Neh. 7:46-56). Although Ezk. 44:6-9 accuses the Israelites of having brought foreigners into the temple and of having shifted part of their own duties to them, he does not call them *nᵉṯînîm.* It is possible that these verses are referring to the same situation in the Second Temple, since Ezk. 44:6-31 must in any case be dated in the postexilic period.

Since the *nᵉṯînîm* come from Babylon and bear a name borrowed from Aramaic (< **naṯîn, nᵉṯînayyā',* Ezr. 7:24), a name then translated by Heb. *nᵉṯûnîm* in Ezr. 8:17 *(K);* Nu. 3:9; 8:16,19; 18:6; 1 Ch. 6:33(48), one must assume that they originated in

---

49. *Ant.* 11.5.1 §128.

Chaldean Babylon. R. P. Dougherty associates them with the institution of the *širkûtu,* one attested especially under Nabonidus, Cyrus, and Cambyses.[50] The *širku,* "consecrated one, oblate," and the *širkatu,* "oblate," were temple slaves "given" *(nadānu)* or "consecrated" *(zukkû)* to the deity in order to gain its favor. The origin of these oblates varied. They included prisoners of war "given" to the temple by the king; slaves "given" to the deity by their masters out of piety; children of insolvent debtors "given" to the temple in order to settle debts; and naturally any children issuing from marriages between "oblates." The origin of the *n^eṯînîm* was probably the same; some might have been gifts of Cyrus, others gifts of Babylonian Jews who, while not returning to Jerusalem itself, nevertheless wanted to demonstrate their bond with the Yahweh temple through a significant consecratory gift (cf. Ezr. 1:6; 3 Ezr. 2:9). The 220 *n^eṯînîm* whom Ezra brought along in 458/457 B.C. (Ezr. 8:17,20; cf. 7:7) came from the sanctuary *(hammāqôm)*[51] in Casiphia, a sanctuary doubtlessly playing a role similar to that of the temple at Elephantine, though probably far surpassing the latter, since it was able to contribute 38 Levites and 220 *n^eṯînîm* to Ezra's train.

In Jerusalem they resided in a *bêṯ hann^eṯînîm* (Neh. 3:31; cf. the *bīt širki* of the Babylonian oblates). Jerusalem's *n^eṯînîm* were placed under the responsibility of one who bore the title *'al-hann^eṯînîm* (cf. *rab širki*) and who himself belonged to the class of "consecrated ones" (Neh. 11:21). The two mentioned in Neh. 11:21 are supposed to be identical with the first two overseers of the *n^eṯînîm* in Ezr. 2:43 and Neh. 7:46. From this one must conclude that the list (Ezr. 2:43-54; Neh. 7:46-56) is not enumerating the families of the *n^eṯînîm* but rather groups or squads commanded by an overseer.

The *širkatu* of the Ishtar temple in Uruk was marked on the hand by the star of Ishtar;[52] Isa. 44:5 also recalls the practice of tattooing the word *l^eYHWH,* "belonging to Yahweh," on the hand. Since this text dates to the end of the exile and reports that foreigners had *l^eYHWH* tattooed on their hands in order to "surname themselves by the name of Israel" (*y^ekunneh;* cf. Targ. and Syr.), this practice might be referring to the *n^eṯînîm,* who included many foreigners. Such a practice was already possible in Casiphia. Nu. 3:9; 8:19; 18:6 attest an expression deriving probably from the consecratory formula of a *n^eṯîn,* one paralleling Akk. *ana širkūti ana* DN *nadānu,* "give to DN for oblate temple service."[53] Indeed, Nu. 18:6 should be understood as "the Levites . . . a gift for Yahweh as consecrated ones" *(hall^ewîyîm . . . mattānâ n^eṯûnîm l^eYHWH).* In Nu. 3:9 and 8:19 this sentence was altered to read *nāṯan 'eṯ-hall^ewîyîm n^eṯûnîm l^e'ah^arôn,* "give the Levites to Aaron as consecrated ones." Since the Levites take the place of the *n^eṯînîm* here, and Aaron that of Yahweh (cf. Nu. 18:6), the consecratory formula of the *n^eṯînîm,* a formula also familiar to the Priestly redactor, must have been *nāṯan* PN *n^eṯîn(â) l^eYHWH,* "give PN to Yahweh as a consecrated one."

The designation *n^eṯînîm* was borrowed from the Aramaic vocabulary of Mesopotamia, where *n^eṯîn* was viewed as the Aramaic equivalent to *širku.* Even if the technical

50. Pp. 90f.
51. Cf. A. Causse, *Les dispersés d'Israël* (Paris, 1929), 26f.
52. *AHw,* I, 421b; III, 1155b.
53. *AHw,* III, 1217b.

use of the word is attested only in the decree of Artaxerxes I documented in Ezr. 7:24, the Aramaic PNs *naṯîn, naṯînā', naṯînî,* and *naṯînaṯ* nonetheless do occur frequently and correspond to the names of Akkadian origin, *širku, širkā.*[54] The oldest attestation of the name *mna-ti?-n[u]* comes from Gozan and is to be dated at the beginning of the 8th century.[55] Since this *naṯîn* is actually a slave, the use of this personal name might attest the existence of the institution of the *neṯînayyā'* already in the old Aramaic temples.

In the long run, the presence of foreign slaves in the Jerusalem temple evoked protest (cf. Ezk. 44:6-9). In response, one tried to attribute the institution of the *neṯînîm* to David (Ezr. 8:20); the corresponding relative clause, however, is clearly secondary (the Aramaic relative pronoun *še* occurs only here). An attempt to ascribe the origin of the *neṯînîm* to Moses (Nu. 31:30,47), however, does not mention their name. The institution of the *neṯînîm* disappeared eventually, and their tasks were discharged by the Levites (Ezk. 44:10-14). This is dictated in Nu. 3:9; 8:16,19 and 18:2-6 (cf. 1 Ch. 6:33[48]), possibly allowing the conclusion that the *neṯînîm,* whether Jews by birth or through conversion, were ultimately viewed as having a status equal to that of the Levites. In contrast, the Mishnah maintains that they were to be distinguished from other groups in the populace, and places them together with "bastards" and foundlings at the bottom of the social ladder (*Yebam.* 2:4; 6:2; 8:3; 9:3; *Qid.* 4:1; *Mak.* 3:1; *Hor.* 1:4; 3:8).

Lipiński

V. 1. *LXX.* In rendering *nāṯan,* the LXX uses the verb *didónai* and its compounds with enormous frequency (qal about 1660 times; niphal 46 times, and 11 times *paradidónai;* hophal 6 times). It uses *tithénai* and its compounds over 220 times; only sporadically does it use *bállein* and its compounds (20 times), *kath/(h)istánai* (13 times), *aphíein,* etc. (11 times), *poieín* (9 times), and *tássein,* etc. (5 times). Substantive renderings (*apó/doma* and others) are unique and lack significance.

2. *Qumran.* The number of attestations in the Qumran writings has climbed to 128 over against Kuhn's concordance (which lists 58),[56] though many cannot be considered because of the corrupt textual situation. Usage corresponds essentially to that in the OT. Phrases occurring frequently include "giving insight, etc." (*nāṯan bînâ, da'aṯ, ḥoḵmâ, rûaḥ,* etc.; 1QpHab 2:8; 1QH 10:27; 11:27; 12:12; 13:19; 14:8; 16:11; 17:17; 18:27[?]; 1QH fr. 3:14; 4Q504 18:2; 4Q511 48-51, II, 1; 11QPsa 18:3; 27:3); "deliver over (to the enemy, etc.)" (*nāṯan beyaḏ;* 1QpHab 4:8; 5:4; 9:6,10; CD 1:6; 4QpIsaa [4Q161] frs. 8-10 3:8; 4QpPsa [4Q171] 2:20; 4:10; 11QT 62:9; 63:10; cf. 59:19); "hold

54. See *AHw,* III, 1217a; R. Zadok, *On West Semites in Babylonia During the Chaldean and Achaemenian Periods* (Jerusalem, 1977), 124; W. Kornfeld, *Onomastica Aramaica aus Ägypten* (Vienna, 1978), 63.

55. J. Friedrich, *Die Inschriften vom Tell Halaf. BAfO* 6 (1967), no. 25.2.

56. Cf. Labuschagne, *TLOT,* II, 791.

court" (*nāṯan mišpāṭ;* 1QpHab 10:3; 2Q22 2:4; 4Q185 1-2, 2:2); "give decrees" (*nāṯan ḥuqqîm,* 1QH 2:37). Outside this expression as well, God is almost exclusively the subject of *nāṯan.* It is he who gives the land into one's possession (1QS 11:7; 1Q22 2:2; 4Q501:1; 11QT 51:16; 55:2,16; 56:12; 60:16; 62:13; 64:13); he gives courage (1QM 14:6) but also fear (1QH 11:4). He gives supplication (1QH 9:10) but also hymns of praise (1QH 11:4). He gives peace and kingship (1QSb 3:5; 4QpGen[a] [4Q252] 5:4), the breath of life (11QPs[a] 19:4), a strong heart (4Q183 1:2,4), compassion (11QT 55:11), blessing (11QT 53:3), but also terror (1QS 2:5), etc. The Temple Scroll deviates from this practice considerably; here, commensurate with the regulations taken from Deuteronomy and Leviticus, in half of the occurrences human beings are the implied subjects. This constitutes a significant difference over against the rest of the writings of the Qumran-Essene rules.

Fabry

נָתַץ *nāṯaṣ*

Contents: I. The Root: 1. Etymology; 2. Forms, Distribution; 3. Meaning; 4. Parallel Verbs; 5. Early Versions. II. Usage: 1. Cultic Reform; 2. *Tôrôṯ* and Parenesis; 3. War; 4. The Prophets; 5. Cultic Poetry and Wisdom.

I. The Root.

1. *Etymology.* The root *ntṣ* seems to be unique to Hebrew; no exact equivalent has yet been found in any other Semitic language (Eth. *nasata*?). Although lexicons draw the comparison with *nts,* "tear up," *ntʿ,* "break out," and → נתשׁ *ntš* (cf. Arab. *natasa*) "tear out," no etymological relationship can be demonstrated. Perhaps this involves various expansions of the root *nt-*, meaning approximately "tear away."[1]

2. *Forms, Distribution.* The OT attests only verbal forms of this root (42 occurrences); in contrast, cf. the Middle Hebrew subst. *n[e]tîṣâ.*[2] Among the verbal stems, the qal occurs most frequently (31 times), followed by the piel (7), niphal (2), and

---

nāṯaṣ. R. Bach, "Bauen und Pflanzen," *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen. FS G. von Rad* (Neukirchen, 1961), 7-32; J. A. Emerton, "New Light on Israelite Religion: The Implications of the Inscriptions from Kuntillet ʿAjrud," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 2-20; J. Halbe, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes Ex 34,10-26. FRLANT* 114 (1975), 115f.; S. Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im AT. BWANT* 85 (1965), 165-69; E. Jenni, *HP,* 184; W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973), 62-79; → חרם *ḥrm* (V, 199-203).

1. Cf. I.4 below.

2. *WTM,* III, 457f.

pual (1). The term *nittᵉṣû* in Ezk. 16:39 is a piel form.[3] The form *yuttāṣ* (Lev. 11:35), usually taken as hophal, is better understood as qal passive.[4]

While *ntṣ* occurs more frequently in some books (8 times each in Judges and 2 Kings; 6 in 2 Chronicles, 5 of those piel; 7 in Jeremiah; 3 in Ezekiel), others attest only sparse occurrences (1 each in Exodus, Job, Isa. 1–39, and Nahum; 2 each in Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and Psalms). The root is entirely absent from Genesis, Numbers, Joshua, 1-2 Samuel, 1 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Proverbs, Isa. 40–66, the Minor Prophets (except Nahum?), and the Megilloth. In Nah. 1:6 *niṣṣᵉṯû* is usually read instead of *nittᵉṣû*.[5] By contrast, much suggests that an original *nittᵉṣû* is to be read in Jer. 2:15 instead of the traditional *niṣṣᵉṯû (Q),* attesting yet another occurrence of *ntṣ* in Jeremiah.

3. *Meaning.* The primary meaning characterizing the use of *ntṣ* is "break up, demolish, tear down (an edifice or some construction)." The verb refers to the violent "tearing down" of houses, towers, walls, entire cities, as well as altars, sanctuaries at high places, and other cultic institutions. Apart from a few examples of metaphorical usage,[6] *ntṣ* refers consistently to the destruction of edifices or objects constructed by human hands. The concrete notion of "tearing down" is so strong that the more general meaning of "destroy" is wholly inappropriate.[7] E. Jenni has tried to show that the qal passages emphasize the action itself, while in contrast the piel passages emphasize the final condition, i.e., the result of that action ("factitive/resultative" piel).

4. *Parallel Verbs.* This specialized meaning distinguishes *ntṣ* more or less sharply from the numerous parallel or complementary verbs of destruction. The closest verb semantically is → הרס *hrs,* "tear down," often used as a parallel (Jgs. 6:25 next to *ntṣ* in vv. 28,30-32; Ps. 58:7[Eng. v. 6]; Jer. 1:10; 31:38; Ezk. 16:39; 26:12). Although extremely close to *ntṣ,* the verb *hrs* adds on the one hand the semantic element "break through" (Ex. 19:21,24), and on the other hand even more frequently the general meaning "destroy, obliterate" (Ex. 15:7; Ps. 28:5; Prov. 29:4; Isa. 49:17; Jer. 42:10). One particularly popular parallel word is → שׁבר *šbr,* "break up, shatter" (Ex. 34:13; Dt. 7:5; 12:3; 2 K. 11:18 with 2 Ch. 23:17; 2 K. 23:15 LXX; 25:10,13; 2 Ch. 31:1; 34:4; *šbr* with *hrs* in Ex. 23:24). In isolated instances, *ntṣ* is accompanied by the semantically related verbs *dqq,* "crush" (2 Ch. 34:7), *ḥth,* "beat down" (Ps. 52:7[5]), *ktt,* "beat, smash" (2 Ch. 34:7), and *rṣṣ,* "smash up" (2 K. 23:12). "Cut down" or "fell" is the meaning of two other verbs used along with *ntṣ,* on the one hand → כרת *krt* (Ex. 34:13; Jgs. 6:25f.,28,30), and on the other *gdʿ* (Dt. 7:5; 2 Ch. 31:1; 34:4,7; with *šbr* in Ezk. 6:6). One final group of semantically related verbs appears in proximity with *ntṣ;* both → נתשׁ *ntš* (Jer. 1:10; 18:7; 31:28) and *nsḥ* (Ps.

3. Contra *KBL*[2] and Lisowsky.
4. Following *GK,* §§52e, 53u; cf. *KBL*[2], 644; *HAL,* II, 736.
5. But see II.5 below.
6. See II.5 below.
7. Contra *GesB,* 531.

52:7[5]) as well as *ns'* hiphil (Job 19:10) have the meaning "tear *out*," offering thus a clear contrast to *ntṣ*, "tear *down*."

5. *Early Versions.* The various translations of *ntṣ* in the LXX confirm the specialized meaning of the root just discussed. The most frequent terms are *kathaireín, kataskáptein,* and *kataspáein;* as a rule, the semantically virtually equivalent term *hrs* is translated the same. Similarly, the Vulg. frequently uses *destruere* (27 times), though also *subvertere* (5 times) and *demolire* (4), and only rarely *dissipare* (2), *suffodere*, "undermine" (Jgs. 6:31f.), *comminuere*, "demolish" (2 K. 10:27), and others.

II. Usage.

1. *Cultic Reform.* The largest group of occurrences of *ntṣ* (16) is found in the summary reports of the destruction and desecration of Canaanite sanctuaries and cultic objects. Summaries similar in form and content — which we will here call "cultic reform accounts" — are found in all the historical works with the exception of J. The formulaic expression "putting away foreign gods" *(hēsîr)*[8] in Gen. 35:2; Josh. 24:14,23; Jgs. 10:16; 1 S. 7:3f. may be understood as a short form of this genre. In connection with an etiology of the name Jerubbaal, Jgs. 6:25-32 recounts Gideon's cultic reform at the high place of Ophrah; 6:28,30-32 mention 4 times the tearing down *(ntṣ)* of Ba'al's altar, and twice the cutting down *(krt)* of the Asherah (cf. *hrs* in 6:25).[9] 1 K. 15:12f. recounts how Asa removed the idols and destroyed the Asherah erected by the queen mother *(krt, śrp);* 2 Ch. 14:2-4 relates much more comprehensively that he "took away" *(hēsîr)* the altars and high places, "broke down" *(šbr)* the pillars, and "hewed down" *(gd')* the Asherim.

2 K. 3:2 recounts succinctly the removal of the pillar of Ba'al by Jehoram, the son of Ahab. Although the account of Jehu's cultic reform in 2 K. 10:26f. has become textually disorganized, it does reveal that both the temple and the pillars of Ba'al were destroyed *(śrp, ntṣ)* or desecrated. Such cultic reform also includes the destruction *(śrp, ntṣ)* of the Jerusalem temple of Ba'al, including its altars and images, by "all the people" (2 Ch. 23:17) or by the *'am hā'āreṣ* (2 K. 11:18) after the fall of Athaliah.[10] The brief summary report concerning Hezekiah's reform measures in 2 K. 18:4 mentions the removal of the high places, the breaking of the pillars, the cutting down of the Asherah, and the demolition of the Nehushtan *(hēsîr, šbr, krt, ktt);* the parallel passage 2 Ch. 31:1 (cf. 33:4) uses in part different verbs *(gd', ntṣ),* adds the altars, omits the Nehushtan, and expands the action to include all Judah, Benjamin, Ephraim, and Manasseh.

Only the final account in this series of similar accounts has a broader narrative scope. This concerns Josiah's cultic reform first in Judah (2 K. 23:4-14), then also in Bethel (23:15-20). Behind and between the numerous additions (e.g., 23:16-18), both

8. → סור *swr.*

9. Concerning the meaning of *'ašērâ* cf. Emerton.

10. Cf. W. Rudolph, "Die Einheitlichkeit der Erzählung vom Sturz der Atalja (2 Kön 11)," *FS A. Bertholet* (Tübingen, 1950), 473-78.

the content and style of the short summary accounts are clearly discernible (destruction of sanctuaries in the high places, of altars, Asherim, houses of the temple prostitutes, with the verbs *nts* in vv. 7f.,12,15, *ṭm'* in v. 8, *rṣṣ* in v. 12, *śrp* in v. 15, and *hēsîr* in v. 19). The parallel in 2 Ch. 34:4-7 offers a much briefer account (destruction and desecration of the altars, Asherim, images, and incense altars, with the verbs *nṭṣ, šbr, ktt, gd'*), one possibly reflecting an earlier stage of transmission. To this group of occurrences one can also add the single Qumran occurrence (11QT 2:6).

2. *Tôrôṯ and Parenesis.* A further group of 6 occurrences is related to laws and to the "sermons" that explicate those laws parenetically. Only Lev. 11:35 and 14:45 deal with actual *tôrôṯ,* namely, with priestly purity regulations (Lev. 11–15). Within the torah concerning clean and unclean animals (Lev. 11), a lengthy insertion (vv. 24-39) regulates cases involving humans or household utensils touching dead animals. Any earthen vessel into which the carcass of an unclean animal has fallen must be shattered (*šbr,* 11:33); in an analogous case, ovens and stoves must also be torn down (*nṭṣ,* 11:35). The occurrence in Lev. 14:45 belongs to the torah concerning uncleanness resulting from leprosy (Lev. 13–14), and within this section to the instructions regarding "leprosy" affecting clothing and house (13:47-59; 14:33-53). An article of clothing that has become unclean is to be burned (*śrp,* 13:52,55,57), and a house similarly affected is to be torn down (*nṭṣ,* 14:45). The occurrence of *nṭṣ, šbr,* and *śrp* in both instances or in their context recalls the usage within the cultic reform accounts.[11]

The use of *nṭṣ* in contexts identifiable as parenetic explication of laws also focuses consistently on measures involving cultic reform. Ex. 34:13 (the destruction of Canaanite altars, pillars, and Asherim, with *nṭṣ, šbr, krt*) is part of the Deuteronomistic insertion vv. 11b-13. Ex. 23:20-33, the Deuteronomistic addendum to the Covenant Code, exhorts to undertake the same radical measures (*hrs, šbr* in 23:24). Dt. 7:1-11 and 17-26 contain two "sermons"[12] concerning the obligation to devote to destruction the country's inhabitants; the directives interspersed in 7:5, cast in the form of positive commandments (destruction of altars, pillars, Asherim, and images, with *nṭṣ, šbr, gd', śrp;* cf. 7:25a), largely agree with those in Ex. 34:13 and 23:24. An additional, almost identical formulation of the "commandment of the ban," actually constituting applicative instructions for the laity,[13] occurs in the first version of the Deuteronomistic "law of centralization" in Dt. 12:2-7 (*nṭṣ, šbr, śrp* in 12:3). The "commandment of the ban" appears a final time at the conclusion of the introduction to the book of Judges (Jgs. 2:1-5; here v. 2); although only the breaking down of altars is mentioned *(nṭṣ),* the LXX adds the smashing *(šbr?)* of images.

As far as the older law is concerned to which this kind of sermon is referring, the authors might have been thinking of the prohibition against covenants with a country's inhabitants (cf. the formulaic *lō' tiḵrᵉṯû bᵉrîṯ* in Ex. 34:12,15; 23:32; Dt. 7:2; Jgs. 2:2).

---

11. See II.1 above.
12. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 67.
13. Ibid., 91f.

Yet this formula, too, is probably a stylistic feature of Deuteronomistic sermons. Hence this more likely represents a more stringent interpretation of the older prohibition against foreign gods (cf. Ex. 34:14 in connection with v. 13; cf. also Ex. 23:24 as well as Josh. 23:7 and 2 K. 17:35 within the parenetic framework of the Deuteronomistic history). This radicalizing of the prohibition is responding to the increasing influence of Baʿal on the Yahweh cult, something first historically discernible in the Elijah narrative. According to the Deuteronomistic understanding, it was these Mosaic "banning commandments" that were implemented during the various cultic reforms, though unfortunately not rigorously enough.

3. *War.* A completely different, apparently purely "secular" use of *nṯṣ* is attested in references to the tearing down of normal houses, towers, walls, or cities.

Insofar as they are found in military accounts, 7 occurrences of this type can be classified as a special group. This applies to the account of Gideon's destruction of the "tower" (i.e., stronghold) of Penuel (Jgs. 8:9,17); this account is found within the framework of the Manasseh tradition of Gideon's campaign against the Midianites in Transjordan (8:4-21). Jgs. 9:45 also stands in the context of a military narrative (Abimelech's conquest of Shechem, 9:22-49); the city is taken *(lkd),* destroyed *(nṯṣ),* and sown with salt.[14]

The remaining occurrences within this group come from accounts of the catastrophe befalling Jerusalem in 586 B.C., as preserved in 2 K. 24:18–25:21 and Jer. 52:1-27, in excerpts in Jer. 39:1-10, and considerably reworked in 2 Ch. 36:11-21. All four accounts relate that the Chaldeans burned *(śrp)* the temple, palace, and all the houses of Jerusalem, and tore down *(nṯṣ)* the walls around the city (cf. 2 K. 25:10 with v. 9; Jer. 52:14 with v. 13; Jer. 39:8; 2 Ch. 36:19). In addition, two accounts relate the smashing *(šbr)* of the bronze utensils on or in the temple (2 K. 25:13; Jer. 52:17).

In general this use of *nṯṣ* and its parallels corresponds completely to that found in military campaign accounts of ancient oriental kings. One example is Esarhaddon's (680-669) account of the conquest of Memphis: "I destroyed (it) [i.e., the city], tore down (its walls) and burnt it down."[15] According to Ezk. 26:9, this "tearing down" was carried out by means of battering rams and axes or crowbars.[16]

The question is nonetheless justified whether the OT use of *nṯṣ* in military accounts, especially when parallel verbs such as *śrp* and *šbr* appear in the same context, is not sometimes influenced by the notion of devoting spoils to destruction, i.e., the execution of the ban. This is a serious consideration in Jgs. 9:45, since "the opposition between Canaanites and Israelites constitutes the background to the story of

---

14. → מלח *melaḥ* (VIII, 331-33).

15. *ANET,* 293.

16. Illustrations of these techniques from the time of Ashurnasirpal II (883-859) and Ashurbanipal (668-631) are found in Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans., New York, 1963), II, 388-93, 446; O. Keel, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. trans., New York, 1978), pl. 5; R. D. Barnett, *Assyrian Palace Reliefs* (London [1960]), pls. 23f., 35, 38, 40/41.

Abimelech."[17] And one must certainly reckon with the influence of vocabulary associated with the execution of the ban in those accounts of the destruction of Jerusalem edited by Deuteronomistic redactors.

4. *The Prophets.* An additional group includes the 9 occurrences of *ntṣ* in prophetic pronouncements (Isa. 22:10; Jer. 1:10; 4:26; 18:7; 31:28; 33:4; Ezk. 16:39; 26:9,12).[18] Objects of such tearing down include cities in the kingdom of Judah (Jer. 4:26), certain houses in Jerusalem (Isa. 22:10; Jer. 33:4) or Tyre (Ezk. 26:12), the defensive towers of Tyre (Ezk. 26:9, parallel with the city walls), and foreign cultic sites in or around Jerusalem (Ezk. 16:39). In 3 instances *ntṣ* is used without an object (Jer. 1:10; 18:7; 31:28). Subjects include the "men of Jerusalem" (Isa. 22:10),[19] Nebuchadnezzar (Ezk. 26:9,12), and Jerusalem's "lovers" among the great neighboring states (Ezk. 16:39). Yahweh himself can indirectly be the acting subject when the verb is used without an object (Jer. 1:10; 18:7; 31:28);[20] his initiative can also be determined from the context (4:26; cf. v. 27).

Within the oracle Isa. 22:1-4, customarily dated at the time immediately following Sennacherib's suspended siege of Jerusalem (701 B.C.), vv. 8b-11 mention measures undertaken to increase defensive preparations, including the tearing down of certain houses (v. 10). What the government understood as "Realpolitik," Isaiah views as a dangerous "utopia" and as a sign of unbelief.[21] In the context of the salvific oracle in Jer. 33:4-9 (here v. 4), as well as in the overall context of ch. 33, whose Jeremianic authorship is usually disputed, mention of "houses of this city and houses of the kings of Judah that were torn down" seems to recall the voluntary demolition of houses in Isa. 22:10; given the context, however, it refers to the condition of total devastation of Jerusalem and its surroundings after 586 B.C.

The 3 occurrences of *ntṣ* in Ezk. 16:39; 26:9,12 stand in the context of judgment oracles against Jerusalem and Tyre. Although in mentioning the total destruction of these cities (*ntṣ, hrs;* cf. *šḥt* in 26:4) these oracles follow the schema of the "military accounts," they displace those events into the future; the enemies do not act independently here but rather as executors of Yahweh's judgment. In contrast, Ezk. 16, whose basic content includes the announcement of judgment in vv. 35,37aα*,39-41a,[22] is again unique insofar as the destruction of the city here is portrayed simultaneously, or even primarily, as a "cultic reform" enforcing sacral law.

A special situation obtains regarding the thematic juxtaposition of *ntṣ* and other verbs of destruction (*ntṣ, hrs, 'bd* hiphil) with the two positive verbs → בנה *bnh,* "build," and → נטע *nṭ',* "plant," at the conclusion of Jer. 1:4-10 (Jeremiah's call narrative).[23] This jux-

17. H. W. Hertzberg, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth. ATD* IX (^{5}1974), 203.
18. Concerning Nah. 1:6, see II.5 below.
19. Concerning Jer. 33:4, cf. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII (^{3}1968), 214.
20. Cf. ibid., 7 n. 5.
21. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1997), 376f.
22. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 346f., 348.
23. Cf. Bach.

taposition recurs in several prose passages in the book of Jeremiah (18:7-9; 31:28; without using *nṯṣ* also in 12:14f.; 24:6; 42:10; 45:4). The verb *nṯṣ* and its parallels are used here as verbal symbols for judgment, destruction, and death associated with the prophet's commissioned message. Similarly, *bnh* and *nṭʿ* are used as verbal symbols for a new dispensation of grace, life, and growth. One can assume with S. Herrmann and W. Thiel that these passages in Jeremiah reflect interpretations imposed by Deuteronomistic redaction.

5. *Cultic Poetry and Wisdom.* A final group encompasses 4 occurrences within the context of poetic texts involving cult-lyrical and wisdom genres, genres that from the outset lead one to expect *nṯṣ* to be used figuratively. Within the acrostic hymn Nah. 1:2-9*, only half of which has come down to us, v. 6 describes the irresistible power of Yahweh's anger: "his wrath is poured out like fire, and the rocks are torn apart by him *(nṯṣ).*" Since K. Marti, the almost unanimous reading is *niṣṣ*^{e}*ṯû* instead of *nitt*^{e}*ṣû,* though the MT also yields an intelligible reading; cf. "the rocks are broken asunder by him."[24]

In Ps. 52:7(5) a wicked ruler is threatened with judgment: "But God will break you down *(yittoṣkā)* forever; he will snatch and tear you from your tent; he will uproot you from the land of the living." Ps. 58:7(6) contains a petition for the annihilation of the wicked in the land: "O God, break *(hrs)* the teeth in their mouths; tear out *(n*^{e}*ṯōṣ)* the fangs of the young lions, O Yahweh." Clarification of the situation in life and cult presupposed here presents considerable difficulties in both these psalms (cf. also Ps. 12; 14; 64; 75; 82).[25]

In Job 19:6-22 Job laments the injustice that God has visited on him: "He breaks me down *(yitt*^{e}*ṣēnî)* on every side, and I am gone, and my hope he has pulled up like a tree" (19:10).[26] Just as the second line is based on the imagery of an uprooted tree, so also the first is based on that of a besieged fortress (cf. 16:14). The use of *nṯṣ* in reference to human beings in Ps. 52 and in the wisdom book of Job once again clearly illuminates the connotation of the "carrying out of the ban" from a new, theologically relevant perspective.

Barth†

---

24. See D. L. Christensen, "The Acrostic of Nahum Reconsidered," *ZAW* 87 (1975) 22. Cf. K. Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton erklärt. KHC* XIII (1904), in loc.

25. Concerning the attempt to discern "prophetic liturgies of lament" here, cf. J. Jeremias, *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels. WMANT* 35 (1970), 110-27.

26. Following the translation of F. Horst, *Hiob 1 (1–19). BK* XVI/1 (^{4}1983), 277; also RSV.

נָתַק nāṯaq; נֶתֶק neṯeq

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT Occurrences: 1. General Considerations; 2. The Verb *nāṯaq;* 3. The Noun *neṯeq.* III. LXX. IV. Qumran.

I. Etymology. As early a grammarian as Ibn Barun (ca. 1100) explained the Biblical Hebrew root *ntq* (Lev. 22:24; Jgs. 20:32; Eccl. 4:12; Jer. 22:24) by comparing it with Arab. *nataqa,* "shake."[1] This root is attested in other Semitic languages: Eth. *nataqa,* "take away";[2] Samaritan;[3] Deir ʿAlla Aramaic (*ntq* itpeel);[4] and Post-Biblical Aramaic (*n^eṯaq,* "tear apart, separate off," etc.; *niṯqā'* = Biblical Heb. *neṯeq*).[5] The primary meaning of the root *ntq* seems to be "tear loose," "tear out."

One should not overlook, however, that *ntq* is also related historically to roots such as *ntḥ* and *ntk* (*ntḥ,* piel only: "cut [meat] into pieces"; *nēṯaḥ,* "piece [of meat]";[6] cf. Arab. *nataḫa,* "take away";[7] Eth. *nataga/natga,* "drag away";[8] *natḥa,* "tear out";[9] *ntk* is also attested in Ugaritic, Ya'udic, and Akkadian, with the basic stem meaning "pour forth"[10]).

II. OT Occurrences.

1. *General Considerations.* In the OT the root *ntq* is attested with certainty only in the verb *nāṯaq* and the noun *neṯeq.* The verb occurs 27 times (excluding Eccl. 12:6 conj.): in the qal (3 times), niphal (10), piel (11), and hiphil/hophal (3). This includes 7 occurrences in Jeremiah, 5 in Judges, 3 in Joshua, 2 each in Psalms, Job, Isaiah 1–39, and Ezekiel, and 1 each in Leviticus, Ecclesiastes, Trito-Isaiah, and Nahum. The noun

---

nāṯaq. F. Crüsemann, "Ein israelitisches Ritualbad aus vorexilischer Zeit," *ZDPV* 94 (1978) 68-75; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 340f.; G. R. Driver, "Studies in the Vocabulary of the OT III," *JTS* 32 (1930/31) 361-66, esp. 363f.; L. Köhler, *Hebrew Man* (Eng. trans., New York, 1956), 47-50; T. Seidl, *Tora für den "Aussatz"-Fall. Literarische Schichten und syntaktische Strukturen in Levitikus 13 und 14. ATS* 18 (1982); K. Seybold, *Das Gebet des Kranken im AT: Untersuchungen zur Bestimmung und Zuordnung der Krankheits- und Heilungspsalmen. BWANT* 99 (1973).

1. P. Wechter, *Ibn Barun's Arabic Works on Hebrew Grammar and Lexicography* (Philadelphia, 1964), 104.
2. Leslau, *Contributions,* 35; *LexLingAeth,* 662.
3. Z. Ben Hayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans,* 4 vols. (Jerusalem, 1957-61), II, 522b, 530; cf. *HAL,* II, 736.
4. J. Hoftijzer et al., *Aramaic Texts from Deir ʿAlla. DMOA* 256 (1976), combination V, c4.
5. Jastrow, 945b.
6. *HAL,* II, 732.
7. Lane, 2761c.
8. *LexLingAeth,* 660f.
9. *NBSS,* 197.
10. *HAL,* II, 732f.

neṯeq is found only in Leviticus (13 occurrences in 13:30-37; also 14:54).[11] The root ntq does not occur in Biblical Aramaic.

2. *The Verb nāṯaq.*

a. *Qal.* The 3 occurrences of *nāṯaq* (qal) already reveal different usage. These include the concrete notion of "tearing away" or "tearing off" a thing or a bodily organ; and figuratively the military maneuver of "drawing out" the inhabitants of a city through deception.

The Yahweh oracle concerning King Jehoiakim in Jer. 22:24 speaks of "tearing off" or even "shaking off"[12] a signet ring from the right hand: "Though Coniah the son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, were the signet ring on my right hand, yet I would tear you off" (unless one is to read *'ettᵉqennû*).[13]

Another concrete use of the verb *nāṯaq* derives apparently from the language of animal husbandry or of priestly sacrificial terminology. The Holiness Code uses it along with *kāṯaṯ, mā'aḵ,* and *kāraṯ* as one of the four castration terms: "Any animal that has its testicles bruised or crushed or torn *(nāṯûq)* or cut out, you shall not offer to Yahweh or sacrifice within your land" (Lev. 22:24).

The qal of *nāṯaq* is also used once in the military-tactical sense of deceitfully "enticing out." According to the narrative of the abomination in Gibeah (Jgs. 19–21), the Israelites planned to "draw out" the Benjaminites from Gibeah "onto the [two] highways [leading to Bethel or Gibeon]" (Jgs. 20:32; cf. the related function of the verb in v. 31, hophal; also Josh. 8:16, niphal; Josh. 8:6, hiphil).

b. *Niphal.* The niphal of *nāṯaq* refers to concrete objects "being torn apart" (twine, laces, cords): "string of tow" (Jgs. 16:9), "sandal thong" (Isa. 5:27), "tent cord" (Isa. 33:20; Jer. 10:20; also Eccl. 12:6, if the MT [*K: yirḥaq; Q: yērāṯēq*] is to be emended: *'aḏ 'ᵃšer yinnāṯēq ḥeḇel hakkesep,* "before the silver cord (suddenly) rips apart"[14]), and finally "a (threefold) cord" (Eccl. 4:12). In one instance, this function of the niphal is employed metaphorically. Like twine, etc., so also can "plans" (*zimmōṯay,* Job 17:11) be quickly "torn apart."

Only once is *ntq* niphal used in reference to the separation of dross in the purification of metals. The prophet Jeremiah is like one who smelts metal; although he wishes to separate the genuine metal from the slag by heating it, "the impurities could not be removed" (*wᵉrā'îm lō' nittāqû,* Jer. 6:29), "apparently because in that case nothing more would be left of the material itself,"[15] i.e., of the people of God.

One peculiar use is made of the niphal of *ntq,* though again quite concretely, in the narrative of Israel crossing the Jordan. "And when the priests bearing the ark of the covenant of Yahweh came up from the midst of the Jordan, *nittᵉqû kappôṯ raglê hakkōhᵃnîm 'el heḥārāḇâ.* Then the waters of the Jordan returned to their place" (Josh.

11. See II.3 below.
12. See I above.
13. See W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII ([3]1968), 144.
14. See *BHS;* A. Lauha, *Kohelet. BK* XIX (1978), 204f.
15. Rudolph, *Jeremia,* 51.

4:18). The sentence is presumably saying that "the soles of the priests' feet extracted themselves [from the water and stepped] onto dry ground."[16] The military-technical function of *nātaq* is also attested in the niphal. The Deuteronomistic history relates that at the conquest of Ai the Israelites pretended to be beaten, fled, and were pursued by the inhabitants of Ai, "so that they [the inhabitants of Ai] were enticed away from the city" (*wayyinnāṯᵉqû min-hāʿîr,* Josh. 8:16).[17]

Bildad's expression concerning the wicked being "torn from the tent in which he trusted" (Job 18:14) derives from the nomadic environment.[18]

c. *Piel.* The piel of *ntq* usually refers to "tearing apart (violently or suddenly)" things that normally cannot be easily torn. Samson tears apart *(waynattēq)* "the [seven fresh] bowstrings [with which he was bound], as a string of tow snaps *(yinnāṯēq)* when it touches the fire" (Jgs. 16:9); he also "snapped the new ropes off his arms like a thread" (v. 12). Otherwise, reference is made especially to the tearing apart of "bonds" (*môsērâ,* Ps. 2:3; 107:14; Jer. 2:20; 5:5; Nah. 1:13); one should note that *môsērâ* is almost always (excepting Job 39:5; Jer. 27:2) associated with *nāṯaq.* These texts refer to breaking Yahweh's divine dominion (3 times), either by the people of God themselves, i.e., Israel (Jer. 2:20; 5:5), or by the kings of the world (Ps. 2:3). In 3 instances the reference is to the bonds of non-Israelite rule: of Babylon (Jer. 30:8), of Nineveh (Nah. 1:13), and of worldwide exile (Ps. 107:14). Here it is Yahweh himself who breaks the bonds in liberating his people.

According to Isa. 58:6, proper fasting includes tearing apart the bonds of the enslaved in order to free them: "break every yoke."[19]

In the allegory of the eagle, the cedar, and the vine (Ezk. 17:1-10), in connection with Zedekiah's breach of the covenant (17:1-24), the prophet employs an expression from viticulture in his Yahweh oracle concerning the "disloyal" vine (Judah): "will one not pull out its roots?" (*hᵃlô' 'eṯ-šorāšeyhā yᵉnattēq,* v. 9).

The formulation of an addendum to Ezekiel's words concerning Oholah and Oholibah (23:1-49), an addendum not attested in the LXX and OL^{S}, is quite unique. This occurs within a second subsequent insertion (vv. 31-34) concerning Oholah's cup of horror, a cup given into the hand of Oholibah, who must drink it and drain it and gnaw its sherds (MT).[20] The addition reads: "so that you shall tear apart your breasts" (*wᵉšāḏayiḵ tᵉnattēqî,* v. 34); this probably "points back to v 3 (v 21) and shows how the judgement falls on the breasts of the adulteress which were once shamelessly offered to the Egyptians."[21]

d. The concrete meaning of the qal is picked up in the 3 causative attestations. The basic meaning "tear out, tear loose," is especially clear in Jer. 12:3. Here the prophet

---

16. Cf. *HAL,* II, 736.

17. See II.2.a above.

18. Concerning the text, see G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 298.

19. Concerning this passage, see Dahood, 340.

20. See G. R. Driver, "Ezekiel: Linguistic and Textual Problems," *Bibl* 35 (1954) 155; but cf. *BHS;* W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 477.

21. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 491.

petitions against the faithless: "Pull them out like sheep for the slaughter, and set them apart for the day of slaughter."

The military-technical use of the root *ntq* is also attested in the hiphil. According to Josh. 8:5f., as part of his preparations for taking the city of Ai, Joshua "entices the inhabitants out of the city" through deception. According to Jgs. 20:29ff., the Benjaminites of Gibeah are tricked into a sortie and thus "enticed away from the city" (*hontᵉqû min-hāʿîr,* v. 31).

3. *The Noun neṯeq.* The noun *neṯeq* occurs in the OT only in the priestly laws concerning leprosy (Lev. 13:1–14:57), where it is identified as a *ṣāraʿaṯ* illness.[22]

The priestly definition of a case of *neṯeq* reads: "When a man or woman has a disease on the head or the beard, the priest shall examine the disease; and if it appears deeper than the skin, and the hair in it is gleaming red *(ṣāhōḇ)*[23] and thin, then the priest shall pronounce him unclean; it is *neṯeq,* it is *ṣāraʿaṯ* of the head or the beard" (Lev. 13:29f.). The reference is probably to head or beard scales (e.g., ringworm, eczema), "probably primarily to the kind of trichophyte caused by hair fungus, one manifesting itself in various forms (pustules, blisters, scales, nodules). Such scales easily infect the hair and beard areas."[24]

III. LXX. The LXX offers widely varying translations for *ntq,* above all *diarrhēgnýein, diarrhēgnýnai, diarrhḗssein* (piel 6 times; niphal 1), though also, among others, *aporrhḗssein, rhḗssein, ekspán, apospán, diaspán,* and *spán;* the noun *neṯeq* is rendered with *thraúsma* (though twice also with *traúma*).

IV. Qumran. The root *ntq* is rare in the Qumran writings, and the most significant occurrences seem to be those of the noun *neṯeq* in the laws in the Temple Scroll concerning the ritual protection of the sanctuary and holy city (11QT 45:7–48:17). Here the unequivocal stipulation is presented that those rendered ritually unclean through nocturnal pollution or sexual intercourse, blind persons, those affected by flux, those who have come into contact with the dead, and those affected by *ṣāraʿaṯ* are not permitted to enter the city (45:7-18); three separate areas are to be set aside to the east of the city, one each for "those sick with *ṣāraʿaṯ,* those suffering from a flux, and those who have had an emission" (47:16-18; cf. also 48:14f.). It is the priest who shall declare unclean anyone with chronic *ṣāraʿaṯ* or *neṯeq* (48:17).[25]

The root *ntq* occurs only once in the remaining Qumran writings; it is used substantively with a meaning attested only for the verb in the OT, the state of "being torn apart." In 1QH 5:36f. the community's misery prompts it to pray in the phraseology of the lament: "Truly, I am bound with untearable ropes *(lʾyn ntq)* and with unbreakable

22. → צרעת *ṣāraʿaṯ.* Concerning the literary strata see Seidl.

23. *HAK,* III, 1007.

24. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 184.

25. Cf. also B. Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran. Monographs of Hebrew Union College* 8 (Cincinnati, 1983), 121-24.

chains." S. Holm-Nielsen suspects that the OT background can be found in Jgs. 15:13 or also Ezk. 3:25 and Ps. 2:3.[26] Of course, Jgs. 16:11f. is also a possibility, where one finds not only the verb "bind" *('āsar)* and the noun "rope" *('aḇōṯ)*, but also and especially the root *ntq* (cf. also Job 36:8).

Kronholm

---

26. S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran. AcThD* 2 (1960), 111.

נָתַר *nāṯar*; נֶתֶר *neṯer*

Contents: I. OT Occurrences. II. Etymology: 1. Basic Meaning "Leap"? 2. Cognates and OT Usage; 3. Hiphil and the "Hand" of God. III. *neṯer:* 1. OT Occurrences; 2. Etymology and Development; 3. The Use of Natron.

I. OT Occurrences. The verb *ntr* is attested only 8 times in the OT: once in the qal (Job 37:1), once in the piel (Lev. 11:21), and 6 times in the hiphil (2 S. 22:33[?]; Job 6:9; Ps. 105:20; 146:7; Isa. 58:6; Hab. 3:6). The root *n^eṯar* occurs once in Biblical Aramaic in the aphel (Dnl. 4:11[Eng. v. 14]).

II. Etymology. The basic meaning of *ntr* is not certain, and one must perhaps reckon with two different roots.[1]

1. *Basic Meaning "Leap"?* It is questionable whether the meaning determined contextually from the qal and piel as "leap, jump" (the LXX translates the piel with *pēdán*) is the primary one, since it is attested in no other Semitic language. It is possible, as J. Barth suggests, that the root of Arab. *natala* ("abrade, whet, drag"; "empty"; "revile") is related in the specialized and rare meaning "leap forth (from a series)."[2]

a. *Qal.* The qal is used in Job 37:1 in reference to the heart that trembles *(ḥāraḏ)* before the power and greatness of God; that heart "leaps up" from its place *(mimm^eqômô;* Targ. attests a form of *ṭ^epaz,* "jump, leap"), i.e., beats vehemently.

b. *Piel.* Whereas the basic stem refers to a movement bound to a specific situation

---

nāṯar. G. R. Driver, "Difficult Words in the Hebrew Prophets," *Studies in OT Prophecy. FS T. H. Robinson* (Edinburgh, 1950), 52-72, here 70-72.

1. *KBL*2, 645, and *HAL,* II, 736f., suggest three.
2. J. Barth, *ZDMG* 43 (1889) 188, following J. G. Hava, *Arabic-English Dictionary* (Beirut, 1951), "to rush forth from the lines [soldier]."

and place, though a movement also taken as iterative, the piel in Lev. 11:21, apparently as an intensive, refers to the successive jumping around from place to place unique to grasshoppers.[3]

c. *Hiphil.* The hiphil is explained from the perspective of this postulated basis "jump" in the causative sense as "cause to leap up" or as an undoing of fetters (Ps. 105:20; 146:7; Isa. 58:6; in each case the LXX uses a form of *lýō*), or is interpreted as a "loosening" or "raising" of God's hand (Job 6:9), and as causing someone to jump up in terror, to start/leap up,[4] or as causing the nations to quake (Hab. 3:6; cf. Akk. *tarāru,* "tremble, quake," and Arab. *tartara,* "shake, stir up, incite").[5]

The hiphil *wayyattēr* (*tāmîm darkô* [*Q: darkî*]) in 2 S. 22:33 is disputed, since the textually more reliable parallel passage in Ps. 18:33(32) reads *wayyittēn.* H. W. Hertzberg, however, suspects that this represents "an inappropriate simplification," and translates "and made my way free and safe";[6] *KBL*[2] suggests (under *tûr* hiphil) for *wayyattēr* the conj. *wā'ettar,* a qal form of *nāṯar* with the secondary meaning "leap safely." An error in transmission, however, would in any case transcend the LXX, since over against *étheto* (Ps. 18:33[LXX 17:33]) it translates *exetínaxen* (A: *exéteinen,* Vulg. *complanavit*) in 2 S. 22:33, the same verb *(ektinássein)* it uses for the 'aphel of *n*ᵉ*ṯar* in Dnl. 4:11(Theodotion 14) *(ektináxate).*

2. *Cognates and OT Usage.* Other Semitic languages offer two semantic clues for explaining etymologically the Hebrew usage.

a. In Aramaic, Syriac, and Mandaic,[7] *ntr* means "fall off/down, drip down." Middle Heb. *nāṯar* (a synonym of *nāšar*) exhibits the same meaning as "fall off/down, detach oneself"; niphal, "loosen, become detached"; hiphil, "loosen, detach"; cf. Arab. *naṯara,* "fall off/down" (leaves, in the Syriac dialect[8]). In Biblical Aramaic, *n*ᵉ*ṯar* occurs once in the aphel in reference to "stripping off" or "shaking off" foliage (Dnl. 4:11[14]). The hiphil of *ntr* in Isa. 58:6; Ps. 105:20; 146:7 can be understood quite well as deriving from the basic meaning "fall off/down"; this would then be understood in the causative sense as "cause (fetters) to fall off."

b. Arab. *natara* means "seize for oneself, tear away, seize through force"; "tear apart (a garment)" (related to *nasara* I, "take away, scratch off"; Vulg. "be torn apart, rip apart" [intransitive], and to Akk. *našāru* "apportion off, separate out, withdraw"). Akk. *natāru* means "rip apart" (intransitive); D "rip apart" (?) (mountains, jaws), *nutturu,* "tear away."[9] This might suggest an expansion of the base *nt-*.[10]

---

3. Cf. *HP,* 153.
4. *HAL,* II, 737.
5. *GesB.*
6. *I & II Samuel. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1964), 390 n. g.
7. Cf. *MdD,* 308.
8. Concerning Soq. *nétor,* for which W. Leslau, *Lexique Soqoṭri* (Paris, 1938), 279, suggests "let out a word," cf. Arab. *naṯara al-kalām,* which according to Hava, *Arabic-English Dictionary,* means approximately "he spoke much."
9. Cf. *AHw,* II, 766a and 806b.
10. → נתץ *nāṯaṣ,* I.1.

Heb. *nāṯar* can easily be understood on the basis of this etymology. In Job 37:1 this would refer to the violent throbbing of the heart ("up to one's neck"; cf. Ps. 38:11[10], *libbî sᵉḥarḥar*), such that it is virtually "torn away" from its proper place (LXX *aperrýē;* Vulg. *emotum est;* cf. Sir. 43:18: *ekstḗsetai kardía*). The piel in Lev. 11:21 would be describing the adroit movements of grasshoppers, who "tear themselves away" from the earth with the leaping of their large legs. The hiphil in Ps. 105:20; 146:7; and Isa. 58:6 can be understood not only on the basis of the fundamental meaning "fall off/down," but just as easily on the basis of "make a quick movement," which would then qualify the "tearing apart/off/away" of fetters as an impulsive and dynamic act, unless ultimately such "falling off/down" is itself to be derived from the notion of "making a quick movement." Driver interprets the hiphil in Hab. 3:6, which portrays the reaction of the nations to Yahweh's theophany, analogous to the Akkadian expression describing Nabu as "tearing apart the land" through the storm winds *(mâtāti unattar);* this is the same sense in which Yahweh "tears apart" the nations, i.e., "scatters" them.[11] If the notion of "tearing apart" derives from that of "making a quick movement," then this might mean that Yahweh causes them to undertake quick movements, i.e., either causes them to "tremble," which might be suggested as a parallel to the shaking of the earth *(mwd),*[12] or that he drives them to flight such that they "disperse, scatter apart" (= are "torn apart").

3. *Hiphil and the "Hand" of God.* It is unclear just what notion lies behind the hiphil of *nāṯar* in connection with the "hand" of God (Job 6:9), which is to cut off Job's life thread. F. Horst takes as his point of departure the alleged basic meaning "cause to leap," and translates "that he would free his hand" (for action).[13] Drawing on the same etymology ("free up, start up"), G. Fohrer seems to assume quite the opposite by understanding "that he would free, raise his hand" in the sense of "that he would withdraw his hand."[14] *HAL* also advocates the meaning "to loosen . . . remove," and refers to a fragmentary Egyptian Aramaic verbal form *tr,* which as an equivalent to *h'dt,* "I remove" (haphel of *'dy*) one should read as *['hn]tr,* "I take away" (haphel of *ntr*).[15]

The connection between *ntr yd* + divine subject is possibly also attested in Ugaritic. The only occurrence reads: *yd ytr kṯr wḫss.*[16] J. Aisleitner derives the verbal form *ytr,* which occurs only here, from *ntr,* "make an adroit movement," whereas in contrast C. Gordon associates it, with no indication of meaning, with "*tr*[?] II."[17] M. Dahood translates, "may he stretch out his hand" and refers to Job 6:9 with allegedly the same

11. P. 70.
12. Cf. *HAL,* II, 555.
13. *Hiob. BK* XVI/1 (1968), 104.
14. *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 157, 161.
15. *HAL,* II, 736, referring to *AP,* 15:35. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, "A Re-Study of an Elephantine Aramaic Marriage Contract (*AP* 15)," *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), 166.
16. *KTU,* 1.6, VI, 52f.
17. Cf. *WUS,* no. 1873; *UT,* no. 2595.

meaning, though he also considers a derivation from *wtr,* "to be in excess," hiphil, "to make abundant," to be conceivable, according to which then *yd ytr* would mean "may he be generous."[18] In any case, until now the other Semitic languages have not offered any unequivocal explanation for Job 6:9. As far as the parallel first half-verse is concerned ("that it would please God to crush me"), the most likely basic meaning is that discussed above under II.2.b, "make a quick movement," secondarily "tear apart": That God might finally "unfetter" his as it were "bound," i.e., inactive or resting, hand, or quickly set it into motion,[19] to cut off Job's life thread.

III. Neṯer.

1. *OT Occurrences.* The noun *neṯer,* "natron," occurs twice in the OT (Prov. 25:20; Jer. 2:22).

2. *Etymology and Development.* This lexeme is of Egyptian origin and is attested since the Pyramid Texts as *nṯry,* later as *ntry.*[20] From here it found its way as a cultural loanword into the Semitic and many other languages, though before the Late Egyptian sound shift (ca. 1200 B.C.), but after the change from *ṯ* to *t,* as T. O. Lambdin suggested: Akk. *nit(i)ru;* perhaps also Hitt. *nitri;* Aram. *niṯrā',* Syr. *nēṯrā',* Eth. *nāṭrān.*[21] The word found its way into the European languages by way of Arab. *naṭrûn,* as well as Gk. *nítron* (also *lítron*) and Lat. *nitrum.*

3. *The Use of Natron.* a. In ancient Egypt natron was mined primarily in the Wadi Natrun, so named after natron itself, and near El Kâb, and was used in mummification, ritual purification, censing, healing, and glass production.[22] In Mesopotamia it was used for skin eruptions; for scab removal, the head should be washed with a mixture of natron and honey.[23]

b. It also appears in Jer. 2:22 as a substance used in purification and healing. No matter how much natron and lye[24] Israel uses, it cannot wash away the filth of its guilt before God. The comparison in Prov. 25:20 recalls a familiar chemical reaction of natron. A person who sings and one who is in a bad mood get on together like natron and vinegar; the mixture "ferments, boils up" (this is why one earlier derived *neṯer* etymologically from *nāṯar,* "leap up").[25]

Maiberger

---

18. Dahood, *RSP,* II, 36, no. 6c. Cf. also idem, *RSP,* III, 83, no. 147.
19. K. Budde, *Das Buch Hiob. HKAT* II/1 (^{2}1913), in loc.
20. See M. Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words in the OT* (London, 1962), 117. Cf. *WbÄS,* II, 366.
21. "Egyptian Loan Words in the OT," *JAOS* 73 (1953) 152f.
22. Cf. *LexÄg,* IV, 358f.
23. R. Labat, "Le premier chapitre d'un précis médical assyrien," *RA* 53 (1959) 8:34.
24. *AuS,* V, 155.
25. So still H. Lewy, *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen* (Berlin, 1895), 53.

נָתַשׁ *nāṯaš*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. 1. Jeremiah; 2. Other Texts; 3. Summary. III. LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology.* Outside Hebrew, the root *ntš* is attested in Middle Hebrew, Jewish Aramaic, Samaritan, and Syriac.[1] It is also attested in Egyptian Aramaic as *ndš* with the meaning "destroy."[2]

2. *Occurrences.* Within the Hebrew canon itself, the root *ntš* occurs only as a verb: 14 times in the qal, 4 in the niphil, and once in the hophal. To this are added 3 occurrences in the qal in Sirach. The root *ntš* is not attested in the Qumran texts (including the Temple Scroll).

II. 1. *Jeremiah.* Of the 19 occurrences in the Hebrew OT, 11 are in the book of Jeremiah (1:10; 12:14,15,17; 18:7,14; 24:6; 31:28, 40; 42:10; 45:4), revealing a clear center of gravity in usage. Of these, however, one can be eliminated, since it is found in an apparently corrupt text; it is universally accepted that 18:14 should be emended from *yinnāṯ^ešû* to *yinnāš^eṯû.*

Within the book of Jeremiah, the verb *ntš* is usually used in contrasting correlation with *nṭ'*. This becomes especially clear when the two contrasting verbs are immediately juxtaposed in Jer. 24:6; 42:10; 45:4, where *hrs* and *bnh* are also variously juxtaposed. This contrasting of the two terms makes possible a more precise determination of the content of *ntš* in the sense of "tear out, uproot," in semantic opposition to "plant." A survey of the texts also makes clear that both *ntš* and *nṭ'* are always used figuratively in Jeremiah to express the loss of land (exile) or the (renewed) bequest of land and an abiding in the land.

One notices that *ntš* never stands isolated in Jeremiah (though at first glance this seems to be the case in Jer. 12:14f., v. 17 already alters this situation), but rather always in a series with one, several, or even all of the following verbs: *'bd, hrs, ntṣ, r''*. This series then also includes — apart from Jer. 12:14f.,17; 31:40 — *nṭ'*, as already mentioned, as well as, subordinated to it, *bnh;* this includes Jer. 18:7, though the connection is not made until v. 9. In connection with this series, R. Bach speaks of an originally four-part form in which the two positive verbs *bnh* and *nṭ'* are fixed from the

nāṯaš. R. Bach, "Bauen und Pflanzen," *Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen. FS G. von Rad* (Neukirchen, 1961), 7-32; W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973), esp. 163f.; H. Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches. BZAW* 132 (1973), 191-202.

1. *HAL,* II, 737.
2. *DNSI,* II, 719f.

outset, while the negative verbs may vary.[3] Because of the difficulty in temporally differentiating between the various texts in Jeremiah, however, one cannot demonstrate unequivocally the existence of such an original form.

In Jeremiah, Yahweh is variously the initiator of this tearing out or of being torn out (Jer. 31:40 is the only text with the niphal of *ntš,* excepting 18:14). The object is never an individual person but rather a group, including nations and kingdoms (1:10; 18:7), the Judean exiles (24:6), the house of Israel and the house of Judah (31:28), Jerusalem (31:40), those planning to emigrate to Egypt (42:10), even the "evil neighbors" (12:14-17); finally, the verb is formulated openly without any concrete addressee in 45:4, in the words to Baruch.

The verb *ntš* occurs in connection both with assurances of good fortune (and then usually with *lō';* cf. Jer. 24:6; 31:28,40; 42:10) and with proclamations of disaster accompanying similar assurances (1:10; 12:14f.,17; 18:7; 45:4). Hence in Jeremiah this term, in reality a negative one, never occurs alone in these announcements of judgment, but rather always with an eye on Yahweh's prospective salvific activity. This absence from the pure proclamation of misfortune stands "peculiarly without reference next to the center of Jeremiah's proclamation."[4] This prompts the question whether the use of *ntš* is to be traced back to Jeremiah himself, or whether it points to a different author. According to Bach, these series of verbs date from the second period of Jeremiah's activity.[5] H. Weippert (passim) also assigns this use of *ntš* to Jeremiah himself, while Thiel and others, probably in view of the various contexts, speak with greater justification of Deuteronomistic origin, as suggested as well by some of the texts mentioned in what follows.

2. *Other Texts.* The use of *ntš* in Dt. 29:27(Eng. v. 28) clearly refers to the already very real situation of the exile; according to this text, this uprooting is a consequence of divine wrath, and Yahweh is accordingly again the subject, the Israelites the object. The conclusion to the verse shows that the statement was made during the period of the exile itself, so that for that reason, too, this must represent a Deuteronomistic text. 1 K. 14:15 also occurs within a Deuteronomistic context in the announcement of judgment to Jeroboam, including the announcement that Yahweh will send Israel into exile, in this case referring probably to the northern kingdom in 722/721.[6] Ezk. 19:12 deviates strikingly from the usage discussed to this point. The lament over the royal house in Ezk. 19:1ff. flows into a statement concerning the queen mother (vv. 10-14). The comparison with a vine in a vineyard indicates that she will be uprooted and, after a destruction of her desires, transplanted in a foreign land. According to W. Zimmerli, the "mother" here stands for the entire Davidic royal house.[7] Thus the focus is on its exile, not on the people themselves. Hence the substance of what is said using *ntš* remains

3. P. 11.
4. Bach, 10.
5. P. 30.
6. E. Würthwein, *Das erste Buch der Könige 1–16. ATD* XI/1 (1977), 178.
7. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 397.

identical with that of the previous texts, and any textual emendation *metri causa* regarding *wattuttaš* is to be rejected for this reason as well.[8]

Within the context of the salvific oracle in Am. 9:13-15 (a later addition), Yahweh assures Israel that he will plant them upon their land and will never again pluck them out. Here the threat of exile is reversed,[9] and both the return to the land and an abiding in it are assured. Both the formulation and the content here recall the texts in Jeremiah and were probably also influenced by them.[10]

Although the various uses of *ntš* in the remaining texts exhibit a more singular character, the semantic proximity to our previous examples remains discernible. Problems arise in connection with Mic. 5:13(14) with regard to the object of *wᵉnāṯaštî* within Yahweh's invective against Israel. Although the text attests *'ᵃšêreyḵā,* H. W. Wolff suggests that one read an original *'ōyᵉḇeyḵā,* since *ntš* is otherwise always found in connection with the deportation of human beings and is never used to express the destruction of Asherim.[11] Mic. 5:11f.(12f.), however, fully supports preserving the reference to *'ᵃšêreyḵā,* so that Mic. 5:13(14) represents an atypical use of *ntš.*[12]

After being rescued from enemies, the petitioner in Ps. 9 extols Yahweh in a thanksgiving hymn: *'ārîm nāṯaštā* (v. 7[6]). The use of *ntš* here parallels our previous findings at least insofar as here, too, reference is made to the depopulation of cities, which probably also includes deportation.

Dnl. 11:14 refers more to an individual person than do the previous texts. Dnl. 11:2b-4 deals with the time and rule of Alexander the Great and with the collapse of his power. Not only people will be uprooted here but Alexander's kingdom itself *(tinnāṯēš malkûṯô).* Although this text does use *ntš* in the figurative sense, it no longer does so in connection with human beings but rather with an abstract notion.

In Yahweh's words to Solomon after the temple construction is completed (2 Ch. 7:12ff. par. 1 K. 9:2-9), he warns against transgressing his commandments; if this occurs, he will pluck the Israelites up out of their land. It is striking that the verb *ntš* does not appear in the source text itself (which has *kāraṯ*), but rather was consciously introduced by the Chronicler in recollection of the experience of the exile.

Finally, the verb *ntš* occurs 3 times in Sirach (3:9; 10:17; 49:7). The latter two occurrences are commensurate with our previous findings. Whereas 49:7 refers to Jeremiah's call narrative and repeats Jer. 1:10 almost verbatim, Sir. 10:17 addresses the nations; God sweeps them from the land and plucks them out.

In contrast, Sir. 3:9 involves questions of upbringing and the relationship between parents and children. The father's blessing lays the foundation (the root), and the mother's curse uproots the plant. Here, too, *ntš* is used metaphorically, though in a manner different from the previous texts it focuses on the foundations of education, foundations that can be not only established positively but also destroyed in a child.

---

8. Ibid., 390.
9. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 354.
10. Cf. Weippert, 199.
11. H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1990), 159.
12. Concerning the problems raised by Mic. 5:13(14), cf. also J. Sasson, *RSP,* I, 436, no. 94g.

3. *Summary.* We have found *ntš* to be a verb that in relation to *nṭʿ* suggests first of all concrete usage in reference to plants, which can be uprooted from the earth. In contrast to *nṭʿ*, however, *ntš* nowhere demonstrates this kind of concrete usage in the OT. Rather, *ntš* is always used in the figurative sense, and almost always focuses on the uprooting of a people or group of people from their native land and on their exile in a foreign land. In this context *ntš* can be threatened as a coming experience, or can be announced within the framework of salvific assurances as an experience (soon to be) overcome. Although Yahweh is the initiator of this uprooting, the actual cause is a deviation from the commandments, or the provoking of Yahweh's anger. Since *ntš* does not occur in preexilic texts, one can assume that the use of this verb derives from the experience of the exile itself, which was interpreted as an uprooting from one's own land in analogy to the uprooting of a plant from its vital earth. The verb *ntš* is perhaps also underscoring in its own way the significance the land possessed for the people according to the OT understanding.

III. LXX. In view of the LXX rendering of *ntš*, a unique situation arises insofar as 14 different Greek verbs are used to translate the one Hebrew verb. For this reason, one cannot demonstrate any special content for *ntš* in the LXX.

Hausmann

סבב *sbb*; סָבִיב *sāḇîḇ*; מוּסַב *mûsaḇ*; מֵסַב *mēsaḇ*; נְסִבָּה *n^esibbâ*; סִבָּה *sibbâ*

Contents: I. Extrabiblical Occurrences. II. Biblical Occurrences. III. Semantic Field. IV. Syntax, Stylistic Considerations, Meaning. V. Significant Texts: 1. Military Context: War; 2. Military Context: Ritual; 3. Cultic Context; 4. Religious-Theological Context. VI. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

---

sbb. Y. Aharoni, *Arad Inscriptions* (Jerusalem, 1981); G. W. Ahlström, *Psalm 89* (Lund, 1959); S. E. Balentine, "A Description of the Semantic Field of Hebrew Words for 'Hide,'" *VT* 30 (1980) 137-53; F. M. Cross Jr., "Epigraphic Notes on the Ammān Citadel Inscription," *BASOR* 193 (1969) 13-19; F. Crüsemann, *Der Widerstand gegen das Königtum. WMANT* 49 (1978); P.-E. Dion, "Notes d'épigraphie ammonite," *RB* 82 (1975) 24-33; A. Dupont-Sommer and J. Starcky, *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré (Stèles I et II)* (Paris, 1958); J. Dus, "Die Analyse zweier Ladeerzählungen des Josuabuches (Jos 3–4 und 6)," *ZAW* 72 (1960) 107-34; M. Eliade, *Patterns in Comparative Religion* (Eng. trans., New York, 1958); J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefîre. BietOr* 19 (1967); J. H. Grønbek, *Die Geschichte vom Aufstieg Davids (1 Sam 15–2 Sam 5). AcThD* 10 (1971); S. H. Horn, "The Ammān Citadel Inscription," *BASOR* 193 (1969) 2-13; P. Humbert, *La "terouʿa." Analyse d'un rite biblique* (Neuchâtel, 1946); A. Lemaire, *Inscriptions hébraïques I: Les ostraca* (Paris, 1977); O. Masson and M. Sznycer, *Recherches sur les Phéniciens à Chypre* (Geneva/Paris, 1972); H.-P. Müller, "Magisch-mantische Weisheit und die Gestalt Daniels," *UF* 1 (1969) 79-94; G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaán según la tradición de Ugarit* (Madrid, 1981); B. Peckham, "Notes

I. Extrabiblical Occurrences. 1. The root *sbb* is attested in Ugaritic in the G stem with the meaning "go around something," "turn into something," and in the N stem with the meaning "be transformed."[1] In the Ba'al myth we read *sb ksp lrgm ḫrṣ nsb llbnt,* "the silver had become plates, the gold had become tiles,"[2] and in the Legend of King Keret one reads in a conjuring scene *sb lqṣm 'rṣ,* "he encircled the ends of the earth."[3] The verb recurs in the Tale of Aqhat, again in the context of conjuring, in the expression *ysb p'lth,* "he walked around his failed field."[4]

2. The root *sbb* occurs in two forms in the Ammonite inscription from the citadel of Amman, a cultic regulation from the 9th century B.C.: *sbbt* and *msbb 'l* (l. 1). The first form corresponds to Heb. *s^e^bîbôṯ* and refers to a "circle" or "cycle" around something. The second, corresponding to Heb. *missāḇîḇ,* though disputed, probably means "encircling, surrounding (upon)." The construction with *'l* suggests a hostile act.[5]

3. The root *sbb* is attested in Phoenician in an inscription from Kition,[6] where *bsbb* means approximately "round about, all around."[7]

4. Several occurrences are also attested in extrabiblical Hebrew. In Lachish ostracon no. 4 one finds the expression *btsbt hbqr,* whereby *tsbt* alludes to a cycle, i.e., approximately "at the return of the morning," "when morning comes again."[8] In ostracon no. 2 from Arad the expression *whsbt mḥr* appears, which Lemaire interprets as "and you will return" in the sense of "you will send back," Aharoni as the military expression "in the survey tour of the morning," and Sasson as "hand over, transfer" (as in Nu. 36:7; 1 Ch. 10:14; Jer. 6:12; 21:4; Sir. 9:6).[9]

---

on a Fifth-Century Phoenician Inscription from Kition, Cyprus (CIS 86)," *Or* 37 (1968) 304-24; G. von Rad, "There Remains Still a Rest for the People of God: An Investigation of a Biblical Conception," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Eng. trans., New York, 1966), 94-102; W. Richter, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch. BBB* 18 (1963); V. Sasson, "The Meaning of *whsbt* in the Arad Inscription," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 105-11; B. Stade, "Der Text des Berichtes über Salomos Bauten. 1 Kö. 5–7," *ZAW* 3 (1883) 129-77; T. Veijola, *Verheissung in der Krise: Studien zur Literatur und Theologie der Exilszeit anhand des 89. Psalms. AnAcScFen* B 220 (Helsinki, 1982); idem, "Davidsverheissung und Staatsvertrag," *ZAW* 95 (1983) 9-31, esp. 15; J. A. Wilcoxen, "Narrative Structure and Cult Legend: A Study of Joshua 1–6," *Transitions in Biblical Scholarship,* ed. J. C. Rylaarsdam (Chicago, 1968), 43-70.

1. *WUS,* no. 1882, associates this latter meaning with *syb,* "pour."
2. *KTU,* 1.4, VI, 34f.
3. *KTU,* 1.16, III, 3.
4. *KTU,* 1.19, II, 12; cf. line 19.
5. Horn, 2-13; Cross, 13-19; E. Puech and A. Rofé, "L'inscription de la citadelle d'Amman," *RB* 80 (1973) 531-46; Dion, 24-33.
6. An administrative document, *CIS,* 86.
7. L. 4; cf. Masson and Sznycer, 21-68; Peckham.
8. *KAI,* 194:9; Lemaire, 110-17.
9. Lemaire, 161f.; Aharoni, 15f.; Sasson, 105-11.

5. Old Aramaic attests an occurrence in an inscription from Sefire, which reads *whn y't' ḥd mlkn wysbn,* "and if one of the kings comes and surrounds me."[10] This is a reference to "surrounding" in the military sense.[11]

6. Finally, the root *sbb* has been transformed in Mandaic into *swb,* though the meaning remains the same, "surround."[12] It should be pointed out that in the Samaritan Pentateuch both *sbb* and *swb* are used (qal and hiphil).

7. These examples show clearly that the root *sbb* as a rule has the meaning "turn (around)" or "surround"; only in one instance (Arad) is the meaning "transfer" a possibility. The context is largely military (war) or cultic-liturgical; the Amman inscription seems to unite these two aspects.

II. Biblical Occurrences. 1. The verb *sbb* occurs 161 times in the Hebrew OT: 90 times in the qal (9 in the Pentateuch, 37 in the Deuteronomistic history, 8 in the Prophets, 36 in the Writings), 20 in the niphal (3 in the Pentateuch, 7 in the Deuteronomistic history, 10 in the Prophets, 8 of those in Ezekiel), once in the piel (2 S. 14:20), 12 in the polel (7 in the Psalms), 32 in the hiphil (once in the Pentateuch, 15 in the Deuteronomistic history, 4 in the Prophets, 12 in the Writings), and 6 in the hophal (4 in the Pentateuch).

2. The word *sāḇîḇ* is used as a substantive ("environs," "neighborhood") or adverb ("round about, all around");[13] it occurs 333 times: 73 times in the Pentateuch, 50 in the Deuteronomistic history (27 in 1-2 Kings), 149 in the Prophets (28 in Jeremiah, 109 in Ezekiel), and 61 in the Writings (23 in Chronicles).

3. Other derivatives include *sibbâ,* "turning, arrangement" (1 K. 12:15; the par. 2 Ch. 10:15 has *n^esibbâ*); *mēsaḇ,* "circular banquet table, couch" (Cant. 1:12), "neighborhood, surroundings" (2 K. 23:5), "round about, all around" (1 K. 6:29; Ps. 140:10[Eng. v. 9]; so also *m^esibbâ* in Job 37:12); and *mûsaḇ* (Ezk. 41:7, uncertain).

4. In addition, Sirach attests 14 occurrences: the verb 3 times in the qal, 3 in the hiphil; *sāḇîḇ* 7 times; *s^eḇîḇâ* once (14:24).

In these statistics, the enormous frequency of occurrences in Ezekiel stands out (*sāḇîḇ,* 109 of 333 occurrences; *sbb,* 11 of 161 occurrences; and *mûsaḇ*). One should also note that the P tradition in the Pentateuch, which stands close to Ezekiel, has a large number of occurrences (of 86 in the Pentateuch, more than 60 are attributed to P).

---

10. *KAI,* 222B:28; cf. 34.

11. Cf. Dupont-Sommer, 257ff.; Fitzmyer, 9ff.

12. *MdD,* 320.

13. Cf. R. Cook, "The Neighbor Concept in the OT" (diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980).

III. Semantic Field. 1. Among the words semantically related to *sbb*, → נקף *nqp* hiphil is especially significant. Of the 15 occurrences of this verb, 11 are associated with *sbb/sāḇîḇ* (Josh. 6:3,11; 1 K. 7:24; 2 K 6:14f.; 11:8; 2 Ch. 4:3; 23:7; Ps. 17:9-11; 22:17[16]; 48:13[12]; 88:18[17]). The Psalms use the two verbs in synonymous parallelism, and the other texts similarly attest either parallelism or an amplification or complementing of the concept itself.[14]

2. The semantic field of *sbb* coincides in part with that of *šwb*. The two verbs are mutually related; cf. Gen. 42:24: "He turned away from them *(wayyissōḇ mē'ᵃlêhem)* . . . and he turned back to them *(wayyāšoḇ 'ᵃlêhem)*." A comparison between the parallel passages 2 S. 6:20a and 1 Ch. 16:43b is particularly revealing. Here the same formula is used in an identical context and with the same meaning, yet the first verb is *šwb*, and the second *sbb* ("and David returned to greet his household"); hence the two verbs are in part interchangeable (see also Josh. 6:14; 2 K. 9:18-20; Ps. 59:7,15[6,14]; Jer. 41:14).

3. Other parallels to *sbb* include: *ktr*, which in Ps. 22:13(12) is synonymous with *sbb*; *'pp* (2 S. 22:5f. par. Ps. 18:5f.[4f.]; Jon. 2:4,6[3,5]); and *'rb*.[15]

4. As a verb of movement, *sbb* appears frequently in close association with other verbs of this type: *pānâ* (Dt. 2:1,3), *hālaḵ* (Jgs. 11:18; 1 S. 7:16; 15:27; 2 K. 3:9; 1 Ch. 16:43; Jer. 41:14; Ezk. 10:11,16), *qûm* (Jgs. 20:5), *yāraḏ* (1 S. 15:12), *'ālâ* (2 S. 5:23; 1 Ch. 14:14), *'āḇar* (Josh. 6:7; 15:10; 16:6; 1 S. 15:12; Ezk. 1:9,12,17; Jon. 2:4[3]), and *nûs* (Ps. 114:3,5).[16]

IV. Syntax, Stylistic Considerations, Meaning. The general, basic meaning of the root *sbb* as revealed in the extrabiblical documents coincides essentially with that found in the biblical texts. One should note, however, that the frequent use of *sbb* in the OT has developed a broad spectrum of meanings.

1. The subjects of *sbb* include persons (e.g., Samuel in 1 S. 7:16; Saul in 1 S. 15:12; David in 1 S. 17:30; Ahab in 1 K. 21:4; Jeroboam in 2 Ch. 13:13), human collectives (e.g., *'anšê hā'îr* in Gen. 19:4; *bᵉnê yiśrā'ēl* in Dt. 2:1,3; *hakkᵉnaᵃnî* in Josh. 7:9; *yiśrā'ēl* in Jgs. 11:18; *bᵉnê dān* in Jgs. 18:23), animals (Ps. 22:13,17[12,16]), or things (e.g., stones, Ex. 28:11; 39:6,13; the wheels of a cart, Isa. 28:27; a door, Ezk. 41:24; etc.). Abstract concepts occasionally function as the subject of *sbb:* iniquity (Ps. 49:6[5]), steadfast love (Ps. 32:10), mischief and trouble (Ps. 55:11[10]), or geographic realities, e.g., a boundary (Josh. 15:3,10; 16:6; 18:14). In Ezk. 1:9,12,17, supernatural beings are the subject of *sbb*. Yahweh or *'ᵉlōhîm* functions several times as the subject of *sbb*, especially in the polel and hiphil (Ex. 13:18; Dt. 32:10; 1 Ch. 10:14;

14. Cf. V.2.1 below.
15. See V.1.2 below.
16. Cf. also M. J. Gruber, "Ten Dance-Derived Expressions in the Hebrew Bible," *Bibl* 62 (1981) 328-46.

Ezr. 6:22; Ps. 32:7; Jer. 21:4; Ezk. 7:22, etc.); this is less frequently the case in the qal, niphal, and hophal (cf., however, Job 16:13; Ps. 71:21).

2. The objects of *sbb* are also quite varied. They include: a land (Gen. 2:11,13; Nu. 21:4), a city (2 K. 6:15; 2 Ch. 17:9), a house (Gen. 19:4; Jgs. 19:22; 20:5), a person (Jgs. 16:2; 1 S. 17:30; 2 Ch. 13:13), an object (Prov. 26:14; Jer. 52:21), etc. In this regard, three objects should be pointed out in particular: *pānîm, lēḇ,* and *šēm.* These form characteristic expressions with *sbb,* expressing significant alterations in the persons involved. (a) "Turning one's face (or turning it away)" can be meant in a purely external fashion, or can refer to a change in attitude, or even to strong disinclination (Jgs. 18:23; 1 K. 8:14; 21:4; 2 K. 20:2; 2 Ch. 6:3; 29:6; 35:22 [hiphil]; Isa. 38:2; Ezk. 7:22; see also 2 S. 14:20 piel, "give the matter a different complexion, change the course of affairs." (b) "Turning one's heart" refers to a change in direction affecting a person's action or thinking (1 K. 18:37; Ezr. 6:22 hiphil; Eccl. 2:20; 7:25 qal). (c) "Changing one's name" usually indicates that a person receives a new task (Nu. 32:38 hophal; 2 K. 23:34; 24:17; 2 Ch. 36:4 hiphil).

The object often stands in the accusative, especially with the qal and hiphil forms, and the verb then means "surround, encircle." The same meaning occasionally occurs when *sbb* is used with *'el* or *bᵉ* (2 K. 8:21; 2 Ch. 17:9; 23:2; Eccl. 12:5). In contrast, *sbb* + *min* refers largely to "turning away from," usually from a person (Gen. 42:24; 1 S. 17:30; 18:11; Cant. 6:5; Ezk. 7:22); *sbb* + *min . . . 'el* implies movement from one place to another, or a transition from one condition to a different one (Nu. 36:7; cf. 1 S. 5:8). The prep. *'al* gives the root *sbb* a hostile connotation (Gen. 19:4; Josh. 7:9; Ps. 55:11[10]).[17]

3. The verb *sbb* thus usually implies a movement that simultaneously involves a change of some sort. This change can be of various types: a change of place, of possessions, of disposition, of behavior, etc. In brief, the verb involves an external circular movement or an inner change, an alteration of things or events, in one respect or another a turning from or avoidance of a place or person. The fundamental meaning of *sbb* takes on various nuances according to the type of change or the path taken. Both this fundamental meaning and various nuances can generally be expressed by compounds using Lat. *circum-,* Eng. "around," or Gk. *kykl-.* In some cases, however, *sbb* deviates from this basic meaning. In order to comprehend the entire semantic scope, one must consider the purpose, context, and special circumstances of the text. That is, the encircling of a person, building, or city can take place for quite varied reasons. The purpose can be protection (Dt. 32:10; 2 Ch. 33:14; Cant. 3:3; 5:7), attack (2 K. 3:25; 2 Ch. 18:31), a cultic procession (Josh. 6:3f.,7,14f.), etc. Contexts can be martial and cultic as well as religious-theological, and are occasionally mixed.

---

17. Cf. I.2 above.

V. Significant Texts.

1. *Military Context: War.* The root *sbb* (both verb and adverb) occurs frequently as part of formulae and texts characteristic of military and martial institutions.

a. 1 S. 14:47 relates that Saul conducted war with his enemies on all sides *(wayyillāḥem sāḇîḇ bᵉkol-'ōyᵉḇāyw)*. A similar statement is made regarding David, using *sbb* and *milḥāmâ;* David was unable to build the temple *mippᵉnê hammilḥāmâ 'ᵃšer sᵉḇāḇuhû,* "because of the warfare with which they surrounded him" (1 K. 5:17[3]). The following verse underscores the contrast with Solomon: "But now Yahweh my God has given me rest on every side" (*hēnîaḥ lî missāḇîḇ,* v. 18[4]). These statements are absolute and global. War and peace completely influenced the period of Israel's first kings, and these formulae seek to describe programmatically the entire life or at least the essential authority of their reign.

b. As antithetical concepts, war and peace belong to the same semantic field, and the root *sbb* is related to both. Ancient cities were normally surrounded *(sbb)* by walls, while fortifications, trenches, siege ramparts, etc., around *(sāḇîḇ)* the city served for defense or for attack. David's first undertaking after the conquest of Jerusalem was the construction of a wall around the city (2 S. 5:9). Solomon similarly concerned himself from the outset of his reign with the construction of the wall around the city (1 K. 3:1). By contrast, one of the first measures undertaken during an attack on a city was to destroy the walls surrounding it (2 K. 25:10; Jer. 52:14; cf. Eccl. 9:14; Ezk. 4:2). An analogous situation applies to human beings. Whereas Samson's enemies assemble (hiphil) around him in order to kill him (Jgs. 16:2; cf. 20:5), Saul's people are encamped around him *(ḥōnîm sᵉḇîḇōṯāw)* to shield him from the enemy (1 S. 26:5,7). Saul slept in the middle of the camp, and his warriors positioned themselves around him. This is the strategy of royal escort whenever possible (cf. 2 K. 11:8,11: "you shall surround [*nqp* hiphil + *sāḇîḇ*] the king, each with his weapons in his hand").

The root *sbb* is used quite often with the meaning "surround with hostile intentions" in connection with other verbs typical of military language. In these instances such "encirclement" is usually a preparation for harsher measures. Thus 2 S. 5:23 (cf. 1 Ch. 14:14; 2 Ch. 13:13) involves surrounding the enemy in order to attack them with the sword; in 2 Ch. 18:31 the purpose is the coming assault (*wayyāsōbbû 'ālāw lᵉhillāḥēm;* cf. 2 Ch. 35:22).

Some texts use *sbb* with *'āraḇ* with the meaning "set in ambush" (Jgs. 20:29; 2 Ch. 13:13), others with *nkh* hiphil (2 S. 18:15; 2 K. 3:25 par. 2 Ch. 21:9).

c. As a holy institution, war in Israel is accompanied by certain rites. In the final analysis, Yahweh both wages war and brings it to an end. Divine intervention is so decisive that it can change the fate of the combatants: "I will turn back *(sbb)* the weapons of war which are in your hands and with which you are fighting against the king of Babylon and against the Chaldeans who are besieging you outside the walls" (Jer. 21:4). Even though the exact sense of the expression *sbb 'eṯ-kᵉlê hammilḥāmâ* here is somewhat obscure,[18] it is clear that Yahweh is directing the battle.

---

18. H. Weippert, "Jahwekrieg und Bundesfluch in Jer 21:1-7," *ZAW* 82 (1970) 405-8, suggests "a turning of weapons."

The role Yahweh plays in both war and peace comes clearly to expression in texts using *sbb/sāḇîḇ*. One particularly significant expression is *'ōyᵉḇîm missāḇîḇ*, one used together with various other verbs exclusively in literature of the Deuteronomist and the Chronicler. Saul conducted war "with all his enemies on all sides" (*saḇîḇ bᵉḵol-'ōyᵉḇāw*, 1 S. 14:47); it is repeatedly said that Yahweh gives his people rest (*nwḥ* hiphil) "from all their enemies on every side" (Josh. 21:44; 23:1). These formulae occur in the traditions concerning the conquest of the land (Dt. 12:10; 25:19; Josh. 21:44; 23:1) and in connection with several kings: David (2 S. 7:1b), Solomon (1 K. 5:18[4]; 1 Ch. 22:9,18), Asa (2 Ch. 14:6[7]; 15:5), and Jehoshaphat (2 Ch. 20:30). Such peace before the enemy is not limited to political deliverance but rather encompasses all of life.[19] Jgs. 8:34 and 1 S. 12:11 use the verb *nṣl* hiphil: Yahweh rescues his people "from the hand of all their enemies on every side." In contrast, Yahweh's chastisement appears in Jgs. 2:14 when he sells *(mkr)* his people "into the power of their enemies round about."

Yet another word combination usually exhibiting military associations is *māgôr missāḇîḇ*, "terror on every side." Although the combination is characteristic of Jeremiah, it occurs elsewhere as well. This formula refers to that particular terror caused by inescapable danger. Jeremiah uses it primarily in divine oracles. In 6:25 it refers to the enemy from the north, in 20:3 to Pashhur, who appears as the embodiment of terror — Yahweh will change his name into *māgôr missāḇîḇ*.[20] Jer. 46:5 and 49:29 use this expression in oracles against hostile nations (cf. also 20:10; Ps. 31:14[13]; Lam. 2:22).

2. a. Josh. 6 contains numerous statements with *sbb* as the central focus (6 times in the qal: vv. 3,4,7,14,15[bis]; once hiphil: v. 11). Although the semantic equivalent *nqp* hiphil is used in vv. 3 and 11, the construction itself suggests the presence of a later insertion; whereas *nqp* is used elsewhere in parallelism with *sbb* (Ps. 22:17[16]; 48:13[12]; 88:18[17]), here the infinitive absolute is used adverbially and is in part superfluous. Josh. 6 is not a homogeneous text.[21] One can distinguish at least two portrayals of the processional: (a) an encircling of the city in silence, culminating in the shout of the warriors and the following collapse of the walls; and (b) a noisy march during which the priests and other participants blow the trumpets.[22] The first circumlocution is completed in a day, and in this case several elements associated with war are emphasized, such as the great cry of the warriors *(tᵉrû'â); sbb* also exhibits certain martial connotations (cf. v. 1; the LXX omits the verb *nqp*, which according J. M.

---

19. Von Rad, passim.

20. On the relationship between Pashhur and this name see A. M. Honeyman, "*MĀGÔR MISSĀBÎB* and Jeremiah's Pun," *VT* 4 (1954) 424-26; J. Bright, *Jeremiah. AB* 21 (1965), 132; O. Eissfeldt, "Renaming in the OT," *Words and Meanings. FS D. Winton Thomas* (Cambridge, 1968), 69-79, esp. 73f.; for additional interpretations see W. L. Holladay, "The Covenant with the Patriarchs Overturned: Jeremiah's Intention in 'Terror on Every Side' (Jer 20:1-6)," *JBL* 91 (1972) 305-20; D. L. Christensen, "'Terror on Every Side' in Jeremiah," *JBL* 92 (1973) 498-502.

21. Cf. M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua. HAT* VII (^{3}1971), 40.

22. Cf. Wilcoxen; Dus, 108-20.

Miller and G. Tucker indicates that the Israelites did not march around the city but rather besieged it).[23] The second march takes seven days and exhibits certain liturgical or cultic features. While the verb *sbb* was characteristic for the first portrayal, *nqp* might be an addendum underscoring the cultic aspects. These aspects become discernible in the presence of priests and trumpets as well as in the number "seven." The march acquires the form of a liturgical procession, though without forfeiting its martial features. However things may stand with the reconstruction of the original text, it remains evident that the present text combines both martial and liturgical elements, with preference for the latter. "The warriors were to march before Jericho *not for battle but rather for celebration*."[24] The amplifying presence of *nqp* lends liturgical connotations to *sbb*. The march around the city becomes both a military parade and simultaneously a processional. The rite culminates in the blowing of trumpets, the great shout of the soldiers, and the collapse of the walls. Both the trumpets and the shout have martial-cultic value.[25] In the present context of Josh. 6, then, *sbb* refers both to a military march around the city and (especially) to a cultic procession as an integral part of a liturgical celebration of the victory won by the Israelites through Yahweh's miraculous intervention at the time of the land conquest. The portrayal of this celebration and victory acquires quasi-magical features; at the sound of the shouts and trumpets the walls collapse without any military action taking place. There is no doubt, however, that Yahweh's intervention stands behind this event.

b. Several elements from Josh. 6 recur in other texts as well that in part have the same martial-religious background. This is especially true of Jgs. 7:16-21. Here as in Josh. 6 (cf. 2 Ch. 13:13-16; 15:14f.) the blowing of trumpets, the great shout of the soldiers, and the parade around the camp all coincide. Gideon orders the soldiers to blow the trumpets on every side of the camp (*s^e^b̲îb̲ôṯ hammaḥ^a^neh,* vv. 18,21) and to shout "for Yahweh and for Gideon" in order to spread terror in the enemy camp. Even though the soldiers do not raise their weapons, the victory comes in a sudden, miraculous, quasi-magical fashion. This emphasizes Yahweh's role in giving his people victory.[26]

Ps. 48:13(12) directs the cultic congregation to walk around Zion. The verbs *sbb* and *nqp* are used as parallels here, with both referring to a cultic procession after a cultic act in the temple itself (v. 10). Although the context is clearly cultic, certain elements of war also appear: towers, ramparts, walls (vv. 13f.). According to H.-J. Kraus, the purpose is to celebrate the glory and invincibility of Zion. Kraus even wonders whether a magical procedure comparable to the Jericho episode might not originally have provided the background to this celebration.[27] H. Gunkel refers to Ps. 26:6b, where *sbb* is used in reference to a procession around the altar of Yahweh *('^a^sōb̲^e^b̲â 'eṯ-mizbaḥ^a^k̲ā)*.[28] Gunkel also points out that such processions are common in other reli-

---

23. *The Book of Joshua. CBC* (1974), 56.
24. H. W. Hertzberg, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth. ATD* IX (⁵1974), 40.
25. Dus, 108-20; Richter, 195f.; Humbert, 29-34.
26. Concerning the role of "divine terror," → חרד *ḥārad̲*, V, 168f.; → שׁוֹפָר *šôpār;* → רוע *rw'*.
27. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 476.
28. *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (⁵1968), 207.

gions as well.[29] One can recall here the conjuring scene in the Tale of Aqhat, which involves a cultic-magical act in whose course Danel performs a ritualistic circumlocution around a field.[30]

The interpretation of 1 S. 16:11 is disputed. W. Caspari (in agreement with many others) explains the text in a cultic sense.[31] H. W. Hertzberg translates *sbb* with "close the circle."[32] The text refers not to sacrifice but rather to the act of anointing, whereby according to v. 13 the brothers are standing in a circle. A similar interpretation might apply to Gen. 37:7. Here as in 1 Samuel the focus is on the youngest brother, who is to rule over the other brothers (v. 18). The sheaves of the brothers surround the sheaf of the youngest and bow down before it. The verb *sbb* is associated here with *hištaḥ^{a}wâ,* which refers to the courtly and cultic act of *proskynesis* (obeisance), according well with our interpretation of 1 S. 16:11ff.[33]

3. *Cultic Context.* One series of texts uses *sbb/sāḇîḇ* in reference to the temple or to acts taking place there.

a. In the course of the temple dedication, Solomon "turns around" to face the congregation assembled for the cult and blesses them (*wayyassēḇ hammelek̠ 'eṯ-pānāw way^{e}ḇārek̠ 'eṯ-kol-q^{e}hal yiśrā'ēl,* 1 K. 8:14 par. 2 Ch. 6:3). Literally, "he turned his face" (cf. Jgs. 18:23; 1 K. 21:4; 2 K. 20:2 par. Isa. 38:2), i.e., he turned toward the people. The wording of 1 K. 8:14 reflects a ritual, both in the turning of the king and in the standing of the cultic congregation. A. Šanda notes correctly that "a solemn stillness enters."[34] During Solomon's time the king exercised several priestly privileges. At the temple dedication, the king acted as the official representative of the people, and for that reason *sbb* acquires an official and ritual sense (different from 2 S. 6:20 par. 1 Ch. 16:43, although here, too, a blessing is involved).

b. Both the Priestly tradition (esp. Ex. 25; Nu. 10) and Ezekiel frequently use the root *sbb,* particularly the adverbial form *sāḇîḇ*. It appears in a series of texts more or less associated with the cult. Thus *sāḇîḇ* is often used in connection with the altar. The sacrificial ritual instructs one to "sprinkle" *(zāraq)* the blood "against the altar round about" (Ex. 29:16,20; Lev. 1:11; 3:2,8,13; 7:2; 8:19,24; 9:12,18). One is also instructed to apply blood "on the horns of the altar round about" (Lev. 8:15; 16:18). Mention is also made of the screen "which is around the tabernacle and the altar" (*'^{a}šer 'al- . . . sāḇîḇ,* Nu. 3:26; 4:26), or of a trench around the altar (1 K. 18:32,35). In an oracle against the mountains of Israel, Yahweh proclaims through Ezekiel that he intends to scatter the bones of the Israelites round about the altars (Ezk. 6:5,13).

---

29. Cf. Eliade, 371; C. H. Ratschow, "Prozession," *RGG*³, V, 668f.; L. Röhrich, "Umgang," *RGG*³, VI, 1116f.

30. See I.1 above. Cf. Müller, 92, who understands *sbb* "as a *terminus technicus* for this cultic circumlocution" and refers to Gen. 37:7; Josh. 6; 1 S. 16:11; and Ps. 48:13(12).

31. *Die Samuelbücher. KAT* VII (1913), 188-90.

32. *I & II Samuel. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1964), 135, 138.

33. Cf. Grønbek, 69f.; Crüsemann, 146; → חוה *ḥwh* (IV, 248-56).

34. *Die Bücher der Könige. EHAT* IX/1 (1912), 221.

Regulations for the construction of the sanctuary include several occurrences of the expression *zēr zāhāḇ sāḇîḇ* in reference to a golden molding around the ark (Ex. 25:11; 37:2), around the table of the bread of the Presence (Ex. 25:24f.; 37:11,12), or around the incense altar (Ex. 30:3; 37:26). Similarly, the robe of the high priest was to have bells of gold around its skirts (Ex. 28:33ff.; 39:25f.).

In describing the future temple, Ezekiel portrays its various parts and the decorations that are to surround it. In chs. 40–42 alone, *sāḇîḇ* is repeated 50 times, usually in the doubled form *sāḇîḇ sāḇîḇ,* e.g., in reference to the external wall (40:5), the east gate (40:14,16), the outer court (40:17), the south gate and the inner court (40:25,29f.), etc. It is interesting to note how Ezekiel associates the construction of the sanctuary with the distribution of the land (45:1f.). The Deuteronomistic history creates an analogous connection between the erection of the temple and the possession of the land. Solomon justifies the construction of the temple by referring to the fact that Yahweh has given Israel rest before all its enemies (1 K. 5:17-18[3-4]).[35] The centralization of the cult is similarly associated with the rest that Yahweh has created for the people before all its enemies on every side (Dt. 12:9f.).[36]

Thus when *sbb* is used in cultic contexts, it is often permeated by elements associated with war. The same texts that provided a point of departure for the analysis of *sbb* in the context of war now serve as an aid to understanding *sbb* in the cultic context. As in the extrabiblical texts, texts that use *sbb* are associated both with war and with the cult, and it is not always possible to distinguish completely between the two aspects.

4. *Religious-Theological Context.* a. In the religious-theological context one should first consider those texts in which Yahweh constitutes the central focus. Some psalms portray him as surrounded by attributes or beings representing his court and ultimately his essence itself. The expression *kol-sᵉḇîḇāw* refers to those who surround him. In Ps. 76:12(11) it refers to the Israelites: "Those who surround Yahweh on earth will form his heavenly entourage."[37] In Ps. 89:8b(7b) the expression *kol-sᵉḇîḇāw* parallels *sôḏ-qᵉḏōšîm* (v. 8a[7a]), *bᵉnê-'ᵉlōhîm* (v. 7b[6b]), *qᵉhal qᵉḏōšîm* (v. 6[5]), and *ṣᵉḇā'ôṯ* (v. 9[8]). The parallel expressions show that *kol-sᵉḇîḇāw* is referring to the heavenly assembly.[38] The same psalm mentions goodness and faithfulness as Yahweh's diadem (v. 9[8]): *ḥasdᵉḵā* [instead of *ḥᵃsîn yāh*][39] *we'ᵉmûnāṯᵉḵā sᵉḇîḇôṯāw.* In connection with the expressions just mentioned, both goodness and faithfulness appear as personal attributes belonging to Yahweh's heavenly council. In and for themselves, however, they are constitutive elements of God's essence. They not only constitute Yahweh's surroundings but also are aspects of his being.[40] In other passages Yahweh appears sur-

---

35. → נוח *nûaḥ* (IX, 277-86).
36. Stade, 131f.
37. M. Dahood, *Psalms 51–100. AB* 17 (1968), 221.
38. Cf. Ahlström, 59; → סוד *sôḏ.*
39. See Veijola, 30.
40. Cf. Ps. 32:10 in the discussion below, and H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom* (Lund, 1947), 150-54.

rounded by theophanic elements. A devouring fire precedes him, and a mighty storm surrounds him *(sᵉḇîḇāw)* (Ps. 50:3; cf. 97:3).[41]

b. In other texts, Yahweh is the subject of *sbb*, and the object is then usually the people or the Israelites.

Since *ḥesed* is an integral part of the divine being, Yahweh surrounds those with his *ḥesed* who trust in him (Ps. 32:10). The same notion is expressed in Dt. 32:10 with different imagery. Here an older tradition is preserved according to which Yahweh found Israel in the desert (cf. Jer. 31:2f.; Hos. 9:10), "encircled" *(yᵉsōḇᵉḇenhû)*, cared for, and protected them. A parallel to this language occurs in Jer. 31:22, though the roles are reversed. The woman (= the people) encompasses the man (= Yahweh) *(nᵉqēḇâ tᵉsôḇēḇ geḇer)*. In addition, *sbb* exhibits sexual connotations here that are not present in Dt. 32:10, since there the focus is more on the notion of protection, although the aspect of love is not entirely absent.[42]

One can also compare the imagery in Dt. 32:10 with that in Ps. 17:8-12. Both texts apply imagery from the world of animals to Yahweh. Both the image of "wings" and of the "pupil of his eye" *('îšôn 'ayin)* express intimacy. Rather than being distant, God's protection implies an almost corporeal proximity. Accordingly, in Dt. 32:10 *sbb* exhibits an affable, affectionate aspect, evoking the notion of a mother protecting her children, or of a bird encompassing its young with its wings to give them warmth and protection. In Ps. 17:9 *sbb* refers to enemies and stands in stark contrast to God's own activity. The psalmists often lament concerning the enemies that surround and bind them. In this situation of distress and oppression the psalmist turns to Yahweh with a petition for help, asking that Yahweh lovingly surround and protect him (17:11; 18:6[5]; 22:13,17[12,16]; 49:6[5]; 88:18[17]; 109:3; 118:10-12). In all these passages *sabbunî/sᵉḇāḇunî* refers to the enemies. This construction occurs elsewhere only in 2 S. 22:6 (identical with Ps. 18:6[5]) and Hos. 12:1(11:12). The latter passage probably refers to the prophet himself, who like the psalmist feels surrounded and oppressed.[43] The 1st person sg. suffix alludes to the psalmist's personal situation and explains this turning to God, who is viewed as a courageous warrior (cf. Ps. 17:13), as a rock, fortress, refuge, and shield (18:3[2]). The psalmist knows that his entire life depends on God (22:10-12[9-11]), and thus he turns to God for protection against his adversaries (118:10-14). He does not fear those who surround him, for God will rescue him (3:7f.[6f.]). All these psalms breathe the air of combat, and describe both the enemy and Yahweh with military expressions and imagery.[44] Job sees God as a warrior *(kᵉgibbôr)* whose arrows whiz about him *(yāsōbbû 'ālay rabbāyw*, 16:13f.). In contrast,

41. Cf. also the explanation of M. Dahood, *Psalms 1–50. AB* 16 (1965), 306; idem, *Psalms 51–100*, 361.

42. Cf. W. L. Holladay, "Jer. xxxi 22B Reconsidered: 'The Woman Encompasses the Man,'" *VT* 16 (1966) 236-39; E. Jacob, "Féminisme ou messianisme? A propos de Jér 31,22," *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. FS W. Zimmerli* (Göttingen, 1977), 179-84; → חדש *ḥāḏāš (chādhāsh)*, IV, 237f.

43. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 209.

44. Cf. V.1 above.

the psalms always focus on the enemies of the psalmist, ultimately the enemies of God, who surround and oppress him, and this is why the psalmists seek God's protective help; Yahweh will surround him with shouts of deliverance *(ronnê pallēṭ tᵉsôḇᵉḇēnî)* and with his steadfast love (*ḥeseḏ yᵉsōḇᵉḇennû,* Ps. 32:7,10). Just as Jerusalem is surrounded by mountains, so also will Yahweh protectively surround his people (*yᵉrûšālēm hārîm sāḇîḇ lāh wᵉyhwh sāḇîḇ lᵉʿammô,* 125:2). Yahweh thus functions as a wall round about Israel, or his angel encamps around those who fear him (34:8[7]; cf. also Zec. 2:9[5]).[45]

The same notion of divine protection is reflected in other texts with *sbb,* though from different perspectives. Ex. 13:18 (like Dt. 32:10) places us back into the wilderness perspective and relates that God did not guide his people directly to Canaan, but rather had them take a detour through the wilderness *(wayyassēḇ ʾᵉlōhîm ʾeṯ-hāʿām dereḵ hammiḏbār).*

The Deuteronomistic narrator who recapitulates the wilderness wanderings reports that the people took a detour *(wannāsoḇ ʾeṯ-hāhār)* as Yahweh had directed (Dt. 2:1f.). This involved a cautious defensive measure understood as part of the divine guidance.[46] The same notion is discernible in Ps. 78:28, when Yahweh causes quail to fall all around *(sāḇîḇ)* Israel's tents.

c. God's providence implies not only that the entire people will be guided but also every person individually, especially those who are to direct his people's fate. "The king's heart is a stream of water in the hand of Yahweh; he turns it wherever he will" (Prov. 21:1). Hence nothing is more natural than that God alters the king's heart according to his own plans, as Ezr. 6:22 relates: *wᵉhēsēḇ* [*yhwh*] *lēḇ meleḵ ʾaššûr ʿᵃlêhem,* "for [Yahweh] had turned the heart of the king of Assyria to them." The underlying notion here is that the events narrated in Ezr. 1–6 attest the governance of divine grace over Israel.[47] The same idea is found in 1 K. 18:37: *wᵉʾattâ hᵃsibbōṯā ʾeṯ-libbām ʾᵃḥōrannîṯ,* "and you have turned their hearts back." Yahweh appears as the God who draws his people to himself through "external wonders and inner guidance of the heart."[48] Here, too, we encounter the theme of divine providence.

d. Yahweh can also cause the office of king to pass to a different person. Whereas the alteration of a person's heart is an inward process, the reigning of a king is external and juridical. Adonijah openly asserts his right to the throne even though he accepts that the office of king passes to another; he admits, however, that it is a divine decree: "the kingdom has turned about *(wattāsoḇ hammᵉlûḵâ)* and become my brother's, for it was his from Yahweh" (1 K. 2:15). Here *sbb* refers to the change of fate, the transition of possessions to another. A similar situation obtains regarding the division of the kingdom after the death of Solomon. The Deuteronomist interprets the transfer of kingship into the hands of Jeroboam as God's will: "So the king did not hearken to the people; for it was a

---

45. Cf. V.1.b above.
46. Cf. G. W. Coats, "An Exposition for the Wilderness Traditions," *VT* 22 (1972) 292.
47. Cf. W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia samt 3. Esra. HAT* XX (1949), 61f.
48. A. Šanda, *Die Bücher der Könige. EHAT,* 2 vols. (Münster, 1911-12), I, 439.

sibbâ brought about by Yahweh" (1 K. 12:15 par. 2 Ch. 10:15). The hapax legomenon *sibbâ* refers here to guidance, almost in the sense of predestination, a turning of fate as in the case of Adonijah. The transfer of kingship from Saul to David represents a similar case. In the Chronicler's interpretation, it appears as divine punishment for Saul's weak faith: "He did not seek guidance from Yahweh . . . [therefore] he turned the kingdom over *(wayyassēḇ)* to David" (1 Ch. 10:14). In these passages *sbb* has legal connotations involving rights that are transferred from one person to another (cf. also Nu. 36:7,9; Jer. 6:12). It is Yahweh who directs the fate of kings and, in the final analysis, also of the people. The changes expressed by *sbb* show divine guidance at work in history.

VI. 1. *LXX.* As a rule, the LXX renders the root *sbb* with various forms of *kykl-*, the most frequent being *kýklos* (182 times) and *kyklóthen* (70 times). The latter always corresponds to *sāḇîḇ/missāḇîḇ,* with the exception of 1 K. 6:29 *(mēsaḇ);* 2 Ch. 33:14 *(sbb);* and Eccl. 1:6. The verb is translated 59 times by *kykloún.* Other renderings include *kýkloma* (4 times), *perikykloún* (15 times), and *hyperkýklō̧̂* (once). It is interesting to note that *perikykloún* is also used for *nqp* hiphil.[49] In 2 K. 6:14f. *wayyaqqipû ʿal-hāʿîr . . . sôḇēb ʾeṯ-hāʿîr* is translated *periekýklōsan tḗn pólin . . . kykloúsa tḗn pólin.* The forms of *kykl-* are well suited to render those passages where *sbb/sāḇîḇ* refers to a surrounding or encircling. The Vulg. usually has *circum-* in these instances.

The verb *sbb* can also be rendered by other words, e.g., *stréphein* (5 times), *apostréphein* (20), *epistréphein* (30 + *sāḇîḇ* 3 times), *metastréphein* (3), *peristréphein* (3). The Vulg. often uses *verto* and its compounds in these instances: *averto, reverto, converto,* etc., though also *transfero, reduco,* and others. The LXX translates the parallel formulae in 1 K. 8:14 par. 2 Ch. 6:3 with *apostréphein* and *epistréphein.*

The verb *sbb* is also rendered by *érchesthai* and the compounds *metérchesthai* (3 times) and *periérchesthai* (7). In Josh. 6:7 the latter word serves to translate *ʿāḇar* in connection with *kykloún* = *sbb: perieltheín kaí kykṓsai tḗn pólin.* Rare translations include *kataklínein* (1 S. 16:11) and *epitithénai* (2 K. 24:17).

2. *Qumran.* The root *sbb* occurs only rarely in the Qumran literature. The verb occurs only 5 times, 3 times in 1QM (5:5; 9:2,13) and twice in the *Hodayoth* (1QH 2:25; 5:35). The term *sāḇîḇ* occurs 19 times, twice in 1QM (5:9; 7:7), twice in the *Hodayoth* (1QH 5:25; fr. 25:2), twice in 1QSb (4:21,25), and 13 times in 11QT.

In some cases the OT background is clearly visible. 1QM 9:2 speaks of the guiding function of the priests, who are to direct the battle through their blowing of trumpets, "until the enemy is smitten and turns the back of his neck [i.e., are put to flight]." In the OT *sbb* is used not with *ʿōrep̱* but rather with *pānîm* (2 Ch. 9:6). This strategy recalls Joshua (Josh. 6) and Gideon (Jgs. 7).[50]

1QH 2:25f. speaks of enemies who are planning an attack: "Mighty men have pitched their camps against me, and have encompassed me [read *sbbwny* instead of

49. See III.1 and V.2.a above.
50. Cf. V.2.a,b above.

sbbwm] with all their weapons of war." This expression recalls Jer. 21:4. 1QSb 4:24-26 compares priestly service in the temple with the service of the angels in heaven. "He will be as an angel of the Presence in the abode of holiness . . and will attend upon the service *(šrt) sāḇîḇ* in the temple of the kingdom."

Most of the occurrences of *sāḇîḇ* are in the Temple Scroll in the section concerning the temple and sacrifice, with much reminiscent of the Priestly tradition (P) and Ezekiel.[51] In 11QT 56:13 the law of the king appears with a formula identical to Dt. 17:14b ("like all the nations that are round about me").

Hence just as in the OT, so also in Qumran does *sbb* belong to the language of war and of the cult.

Garcia-López

---

51. Cf. V.2.c above.

סָבַל *sāḇal;* סֵבֶל *sēḇel;* *סֹבֶל **sōḇel;* סַבָּל *sabbāl;* *סְבָלוֹת **sᵉḇālôṯ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. OT Evidence: 1. The Verb; 2. **sōḇel* and *sēḇel;* 3. Burden Bearing. III. LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology.* In the Semitic languages the root *sbl* exhibits a colorful palette, one made even more colorful by the presence, in addition to *sbl,* of the root → זבול *zᵉḇul (zᵉbhul),* which probably arose through regressive partial assimilation of the voiceless *s* to the voiced *b.*[1] Akkadian attests *zabālu* (in isolated instances also *sabālu* or *ṣabālu*) with the meaning "carry, transport," specifically also in reference to the carrying of bricks.[2] From this one can hardly separate the noun *zabbīlu,* "basket," in addition to *sablum* as a Canaanite loanword with the meaning "work force" in the Mari texts.[3]

---

sāḇal. M. Held, "The Root ZBL/SBL in Akkadian, Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew," *Essays in Memory of E. A. Speiser. JAOS* 88 (1968) 90-96; T. N. D. Mettinger, "Excursus: The Term סבל," *Solomonic State Officials. CB* 5 (1971), 137-39; A. F. Rainey, "Compulsory Labour Gangs in Ancient Israel," *IEJ* 20 (1970) 191-202; M. Wagner, "Beiträge zur Aramaismenfrage im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 355-71, esp. 362-64.

1. According to C. Brockelmann, *VG,* I, 163, however, this partial assimilation in juxtaposition, *sb > zb,* is attested only for Ethiopic.

2. *CAD,* XXI, 1-5; *AHw,* III, 1500f. Cf. Held, 92; A. Salonen, *Die Ziegeleien im alten Mesopotamien. AnAcScFen* B 171 (1972), 199f.

3. For the former see *CAD,* XXI, 6f.; *AHw,* III, 1501b; for the latter, *AHw,* II, 999b.

In *CAD* and *AHw*, the classification of *zabbīlu* as an Aramaic loanword derives from the fact that *zabbīlu* is not an Akkadian nominal form, though it must be noted that Syr. *zabîlāʾ/zanbîlāʾ*, "basket," lacks an endemic Syriac etymon and in its own turn derives from Akk. *zabālu*.

The term *sblt*, "burden," listed in *WUS*, no. 1886, does not exist in Ugaritic; instead of reading *sblt ʿṣm.ʾrṣ*, "the burden of the fruits of the earth," one should read rather *sb.l qṣm ʾrṣ*, "they went round about to the ends of the earth."[4] But the root *zbl* is well documented as the noun *zbl* in the sense of "prince, principality," as "sick person, illness," and as a place-name.[5] Ugar. *zbl* is the semantic equivalent of Heb. *nāśîʾ*, while *zbl* with the meaning "sick person" can probably be explained as a development from "carry" to "endure, bear, be ill."[6]

Aramaic attests on the one hand Syr. *zabbîlāʾ* or *zanbîlāʾ*, "basket"[7] — borrowed probably from Akk. *zabbīlu* — in addition to Syr. *sᵉḇal*, "carry, carry away, endure, suffer," with several derivatives. Sam. *sbl* coincides with the Syriac and with Mand. *sbl/swl*,[8] while in Jewish Aramaic and Christian Palestinian Aramaic the figurative usage predominates with the meaning "endure, bear."[9] A striking semantic shift took place in Official Aramaic, where *sbl* was used in the sense of "support someone, assume responsibility for a person's upkeep."[10] In Arabic one finds *zabbala*, "fertilize," in addition to *zabala*, "carry, carry away."[11] One might possibly also mention Tigre *šabela*, "spice container,"[12] with reference to Akk. *zabbīlu* and Syr. *zabîlāʾ*, "basket," if this is not a Cushite word. W. Leslau finds evidence also for Tigr. *sablala*, "to load, burden," and *šablala*, "load lightly," with which one may also compare Gurage *ašballala* or *šᵉfallala*, "load an empty sack or skin (on the donkey)."[13]

We thus find that Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Hebrew, as well as Arabic, all attest a root *zbl*,[14] whose basic meaning is "carry, carry away." In Aramaic this root appears with the same basic meaning as *sbl*. It is possible that in Hebrew we are dealing with an Aramaism inherited quite early.[15]

2. *Occurrences.* The verb *sāḇal* occurs 7 times in the qal in the OT (5 of those in Deutero-Isaiah); a pual participle occurs in Ps. 144:14, and a hithpael form in Eccl.

---

4. *KTU*, 1.16, III, 3.
5. *KTU*, 4.213, 13.
6. Held, 92, 93.
7. *LexSyr*, 187a, 201a.
8. Cf. Z. Ben Ḥayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans*, 5 vols. (Jerusalem, 1957-77), I-II, 522; IV, 467; *MdD*, 316b.
9. *WTM*, III, 466f.; F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (Berlin, 1903), 130.
10. *DNSI*, II, 774f.; also Hermopolis, *Excavations at El-Ashmonein* (London, 1983), I, 5; cf. Beyer, 643.
11. Lane, 1212c; J. Barth, *Etymologische Studien zum semitischen insbesondere zum hebräischen Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1893), 50.
12. *WbTigr*, 215b.
13. *Contributions*, 36.
14. → זבל *zᵉḇul (zᵉbhul)* (IV, 29-31).
15. Cf. Wagner, 364, picking up a suggestion by M. Noth.

12:5. A po'el or po'al participle occurs in the Aramaic text of Ezr. 6:3 in an unclear context. Among the nominal forms attested, *sēḇel* occurs 3 times (1 K. 11:28; Neh. 4:11[Eng. v. 17]; Ps. 81:7[6]), **sōḇel* similarly 3 times (Isa. 9:3[4]; 10:27; 14:26), *sabbāl* 5 times (1 K. 5:29[15]; 2 Ch. 2:1,17[2,18]; 34:13; Neh. 4:4[10]), and **s^e^ḇālôṯ* 6 times (Ex. 1:11; 2:11; 5:4,5; 6:6,7).

II. OT Evidence.

1. *The Verb.* The verb *sāḇal* means "carry" in the qal; cf. Isa. 46:7, where an idol is carried around in a procession. The form *sāḇal* also occurs in Jacob's blessing in the characterization of Issachar (Gen. 49:15), who bowed his shoulder for bearing burdens *(wayyēṭ šiḵmô lisbōl),*[16] becoming thereby a slave at forced labor *(mas 'ōḇēḏ).*[17] Lam. 5:7 points out that the children will have to bear the guilt of their fathers' sins as punishment. In what is known as the fourth Servant Song, we read that the servant bore our sicknesses and carried our pains (Isa. 53:4), and shortly thereafter (v. 11) an expression similar to that in Lam. 5:7 relates that he bears the *'ᵃwōnôṯ* of the many. M. Held points out that the root *zbl* occurs several times in Akkadian in connection with illness, as attested in Ugaritic for *zbl*, "sick person."[18] This figurative usage in the sense of "bear, suffer," can also be observed in Aramaic.[19] In Isa. 46:4 Yahweh confirms that he will "carry" his people in all its ages (*sbl* par. *nś'*). J. Rabinowitz draws attention to the fact that this represents a usage of *sāḇal* also frequently encountered in Egyptian Aramaic in the sense of "support someone, assume responsibility for a person's upkeep."[20]

The pual ptcp. *m^e^subbālîm* occurs in Ps. 144:14 as an explication of *'allûpēnû* (*'allûp* = ox? as yet in Sir. 38:25). LXX *pacheís,* Vulg. *crassi* or *crassae* (Jerome: *pingues*), and Syr. *'synn* suggest fat animals. Whereas F. Baethgen suggests beasts of burden, and H. Schmidt pregnant oxen (despite the masc. pl.), B. Duhm points out the difficulties deriving from the fact that *'allûp* otherwise refers to the tribal chief or to a confidant, that if *m^e^subbālîm* meant "pregnant" one would expect a feminine form, and that precisely the most important piece of information is missing if the reference is to beasts of burden, namely, just what these oxen are carrying.[21] Hence Duhm sees in *'allûpēnû m^e^subbālîm* a corrupted variant relating to *ma'ᵃlîpôṯ m^e^rubbāḇôṯ* in v. 13b. J. Ziegler has offered a new suggestion regarding the textual criticism of v. 14, reading *'ᵃlāpēnû missubbālîm* and translating "our provinces without burdens, no incursion and no marching off, no cry of distress in our streets."[22]

The concluding poem in Ecclesiastes (11:9–12:7), about youth and old age, describes

16. Held, 95, reads *l^e^sēḇel.*

17. Cf. A. Alt, "Neues über Palästina aus dem Archiv Amenophis IV," *KlSchr,* III (1959), 169-75.

18. Held, 92f.; *WUS,* no. 878, II.

19. Cf. I.1 above.

20. "A Note on Isa 46:4," *JBL* 73 (1954) 237.

21. Baethgen, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (1897), 423f.; Schmidt, *Die Psalmen. HAT* XV (1934), 250; Duhm, *Die Psalmen. KHC* XIV (²1922), 472.

22. "Ps 144,14," *Wort und Geschichte. FS K. Elliger. AOAT* 18 (1973), 191-97.

the troubles of old age largely in the form of allegory; in 12:5 it contains three images that scholars have variously interpreted: the almond, the grasshopper, and the caper berry. The hithpael of *sāḇal* in the expression *wᵉyistabbēl heḥāgāḇ* might mean that the grasshopper tries to "carry itself" in the sense of dragging itself along. The *ḥāgāḇ* would then be a type of grasshopper unable to fly. Or one might think of the grasshopper's immoderate consumption, translating "it loads up," i.e., it burdens itself through hearty eating.[23] Or, like O. Loretz, one understands the hithpael of *sāḇal* as referring to pregnancy, and translates "the grasshopper multiplies."[24] The three metaphors of these natural processes were understood allegorically. The blooming of the almond tree might symbolize an old man's white hair (less likely: the inability to crack almonds); the bursting of the caper has been understood as a reference to the diminishing healing power of the plant with regard to older people, or to the inefficacy of aphrodisiacs with regard to old men. In contrast, the grasshopper allegedly alludes to the stiff movements of an old man or to his sexual impotency.[25] More recent scholars are inclined to understand the three metaphors as realistic references to the cycles of nature with their blossoming and fruitfulness, in contrast to human life, which moves toward the grave.[26]

In Darius's response (Ezr. 6:1-12), given in Aramaic and including parts of the edict of Cyrus, v. 3 says the following regarding the house of God in Jerusalem: "Let the house be rebuilt as a place where sacrifices are offered *wᵉ'uššôhî mᵉsôḇᵉlîn*." The *'uššayyā'* are the foundations (cf. 4:12; 5:16), and *mᵉsôḇᵉlîn* is the po'el or po'al participle. It is self-evident that foundations are "bearing" in the sense of capable of bearing loads (po'el ptcp.), but not that foundations are themselves "borne" in the sense of erected (po'al ptcp.). Thus interpreters, following the lead of 3 Ezr. 6:23 *(hópou epithýousin diá pyrós endelechoús)* usually point *'eššôhî*, and translate "and where one offers his burnt offerings" (shaphel, from *ybl*). The suffix lacks any reference, however, thus detracting from this solution. Since one expects a transition to the following construction directives, W. Rudolph's suggestion seems quite plausible: to read *ûmišḥôhî mittᵉḵilîn*, "and its dimensions are to be measured."[27]

2. **sōḇel* and *sēḇel*.

a. **sōḇel*. The noun **sōḇel* occurs 3 times in Isaiah (9:3[4]; 10:27; 14:25). In 14:25 a redactor takes 10:27a as the point of departure, a verse for which 9:3(4) provides the background, and asserts that the victory over Assyria will simultaneously usher in the hour of freedom for the people.[28] The yoke of his burden *('ōl subbᵒlô)* will be broken

---

23. H. W. Hertzberg, *Der Prediger. KAT* XVII/4-5 (1963), 207, "it stuffs itself"; cf. LXX *pachynthę̄*.

24. *Qohelet und der Alte Orient* (Freiburg, 1964), 190 n. 228.

25. Cf. *HAL*, I, 290; F. Delitzsch, *Comm. on the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes. KD* (Eng. trans., repr. Grand Rapids, 1950), 414f.

26. Cf. W. Zimmerli, *Prediger. ATD* XVI/1 (³1980), 242.

27. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia samt 3. Esra. HAT* XX (1949), 54. See K. Galling, "Kyrusedikt und Tempelbau," *OLZ* 40 (1937) 477, "and one shall take along his construction directive *'šrn*'."

28. Cf. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 48f.

(9:3[4]), and his burden will depart from its shoulder (10:27; 14:25). The "burden" is used here in the figurative sense to refer to foreign rule, consisting primarily of forced labor, of the pulling of burdens and loads.

b. *sēḇel.* One can discern hardly any difference between **sōḇel* and *sēḇel* in Ps. 81:7(6). In retrospect of Israel's bondage in Egypt, the psalm emphasizes that Yahweh took away a burden *(sēḇel)* from the shoulder of his people and freed its hand from the basket *(dûḏ).* In contrast, 1 K. 11:28 uses *sēḇel* as a general word for the labor of bearing burdens. Solomon commissions the property owner Jeroboam, whose industrious talents have become evident, with overseeing all the burden bearers of the house of Joseph.[29]

3. *Burden Bearing.* The form **sᵉḇālôṯ,* attested only in the plural, always refers to the Israelites' forced labor in Egypt (Ex. 1:11; 2:11; 5:4,5; 6:6,7). T. N. D. Mettinger understands *mas,* "forced construction labor," and **sᵉḇālôṯ,* "burden bearing," as synonyms referring to the same activity, while M. Noth and A. F. Rainey believe two different activities are at issue: the transport of goods necessary for construction (**sᵉḇālôṯ),* i.e., "organized transport," and then the forced labor generally enlisted in construction projects *(mas).*[30] The passages in Exodus show that **sᵉḇālôṯ* is a general expression for the Israelites' forced labor in Egypt, e.g., in connection with construction projects establishing store-cities such as Pithom and Raamses (Ex. 1:11).[31]

Burden bearers, along with hewers of stone, constitute an important contingent within the infrastructure of the labor force during the period of the monarchy. The custom of officially enlisting sojourners *(gērîm),* primarily remnants of the pre-Israelite Canaanite population, as auxiliary laborers goes back apparently to David (cf. 1 Ch. 22:2; also 2 S. 20:24). It is said that, in addition to 80,000 hewers of stone, Solomon had at his disposal 70,000 burden bearers as laborers (*sabbāl;* 1 K. 5:29[15] *nōśē' sabbāl,* which Noth identifies as bearers, specifically burden bearers; the par. 2 Ch. 2:1 reads *'îš sabbāl;* v. 17, *sabbāl*). Only by enlisting such a large number of laborers (the numbers are hardly authentic) could the intense construction activity under Solomon and later Josiah be successful. 1 K. 5:29(15) also shows that the burden bearers were distinguished from forced labor.[32] 2 Ch. 34:13 relates that the Levites regulated certain work, in particular that of the burden bearers, in both tempo and rhythm with their instruments.[33]

Burden bearers again play an important role as voluntary labor groups in the reconstruction of Jerusalem by Nehemiah. Neh. 4:11(17) says specifically that the burden bearers, *hannōśᵉ'îm bassebel,* were armed (read *ḥᵃmušîm*), pursuing their burden bear-

29. Cf. Mettinger, 136, 138.

30. Mettinger, 138f.; Noth, *Könige (1–16). BK* IX/1 (²1983), 257f.; Rainey, 200ff.

31. Cf. W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus. BK* II (1974), 35.

32. → מס *mas* (VIII, 427-30); cf. Rainey, 200f.

33. Cf. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* XXI (1955), 323, who adduces examples from antiquity and modernity suggesting that the work of slaves had to be carried out to the tempo of instruments.

ing with one hand, probably primarily removing debris, while holding the other hand on their weapon to protect themselves against violent attacks by Nehemiah's adversaries. Neh. 4:4(10) preserves a ditty of these burden bearers: *kāšal kōaḥ hassabbāl w^ehe'āpār harbēh wa^anaḥnû lō' nûḵal liḇnôṯ baḥômâ,* "the strength of the burden bearers is failing, and there is yet much rubbish; thus we are not able to work on the wall."

II. LXX. No consistent rendering of the root *sbl* is discernible in the LXX. The verb is rendered once each with *poneín, anéchein, analambánein, poreúesthai, odynán, anaphérein,* and *hypéchein.* In Ps. 144:14 and Eccl. 12:5 the LXX thinks in terms of "being fat" *(pachýs, pachýein).* The form *sēḇel* is rendered by *ársis* and once (Neh. 4:11[17]) by *artḗr;* the rendering of *sabbāl* is twice (pl.) *aírontes ársin, nōtophórōn,* and once (Neh. 4:4[10]) *tṓn echthrṓn* (derived from *achthyphórōn*?). Renderings for **s^eḇālôṯ* include *érgon, pónos,* and *dynasteía; *sōḇel* is rendered once with *zygós,* in Isa. 10:27 with *phóbos* (derived from *phóros*?), and in Isa. 14:25 with *kýdos* (derived from *kḗdos?*). The root *sbl* is not attested in the Qumran literature.

Kellermann(†)

סְגֻלָּה *s^egullâ*

Contents: I. Distribution: 1. In the OT; 2. Outside the OT. II. 1. Conceptual and Semantic Field Outside the OT; 2. Rabbinical Usage. III. OT Usage: 1. Ancient Versions; 2. Hebrew Text.

I. Distribution.

1. *In the OT.* The word *s^egullâ* is attested only 8 times in the OT. It refers in 6 instances to the people as a whole, who are called the *s^egullâ* of Yahweh (Ex. 19:5; Ps. 135:4; Mal. 3:17) or the *'am s^egullâ* (Dt. 7:6; 14:2; 26:18), and twice to the royal treasures (1 Ch. 29:3; Eccl. 2:8). In 1 Ch. 29:3 David's *s^egullâ* consists of gold and silver that he conse-

---

s^egullâ. O. Bächli, *Israel und die Völker. ATANT* 41 (1962), 142-44; N. A. Dahl, "A People for His Name," *NTS* 4 (1957-58) 319-27; G. R. Driver and J. C. Miles, *The Babylonian Laws,* 2 vols. (Oxford, 1952-55), II, 221f.; M. Greenberg, "Hebrew *s^egullā:* Akkadian *sikiltu,*" *JAOS* 71 (1951) 172-74; M. Held, "A Faithful Lover in an Old Babylonian Dialogue," *JCS* 15 (1961) 1-26, esp. 11f.; cf. idem, "A Faithful Lover in an Old Babylonian Dialogue (JCS XV, pp. 1-26) Addenda et Corrigenda," *JCS* 16 (1962) 38; F. Horst, "Das Eigentum nach dem AT," *Gottes Recht: Gesammelte Studien zum Recht im AT. ThB* 12 (1961), 203-21; S. Loewenstamm, "*'am s^egullāh,*" *Hebrew Language Studies Presented to Prof. Ze'ev Ben-Hayyim* (Jerusalem, 1983), 321-28 (Heb.); H. Preisker, "περιούσιος," *TDNT,* VI, 57f.; G. Rinaldi, "'Territorio' e società nell'AT," *BeO* 22 (1980) 161-74; E. A. Speiser, "The Hurrian Equivalent of *sikiltu(m),*" *Or,* N.S. 25 (1956) 1-4; B. Uffenheimer, "The Semantics of סגולה," *BethM* 22 (1976/77) 427-34, 529f.; H. Wildberger, *Jahwes Eigentumsvolk. ATANT* 37 (1960), 71-79; idem, "סְגֻלָּה *s^egullâ* property," *TLOT,* II, 791-93.

crates to Yahweh. The *s^e gullâ* represents his personal fortune, and the dignitaries of the kingdom follow the royal example by offering their own fortunes to the temple treasury (1 Ch. 29:6-8). In the virtually contemporary text Eccl. 2:8, the "royal *s^e gullâ*" is mentioned after the silver and gold that Qoheleth has accumulated for himself. The expression is thus alluding to a treasure that this royal personality has acquired for himself, and is being used probably in apposition to "silver and gold" (exactly as in 1 Ch. 29:3). It is followed by the word *hmdynwt,* which is usually translated "the provinces." The presence of the article as well as the unexpected mention of these provinces indicates that the text has been corrupted here. Perhaps one should read *hmdnywt* = **hammiddānîyôṯ,* an aramaizing double plural of *middâ* < *maddattu,* "tribute" (Ezr. 4:20; 6:8; Neh. 5:4); cf. *bîrānîyôṯ,* pl. of *bîrâ* (2 Ch. 17:12; 27:4, my addition).

2. *Outside the OT.* The word *s^e gullâ* then also appears in Mishnaic and Talmudic Hebrew, where it refers to the reserve fund a person has set aside.[1] The verb *siggēl* is a denominative derived from *s^e gullâ* whose usage is identical with the Akkadian expression *sikilta(m) sakālu.* From this one can conclude that Akk. *sikiltu* and Heb. *s^e gullâ* derive from the same Semitic root, and refer to the same semantic field. The transition from the voiced *g* to a voiceless *k* is attested in other instances as well. This phenomenon does not occur in the Babylonian dialect variations *šigiltu(m), šagiltu(m),* and the verb *šagālu,* which instead attest the familiar alternation of *s* and *š.* Accordingly, any investigation of the biblical word *s^e gullâ* must take account of the use of *s^e gullâ* and *siggēl* in the Mishna and Talmud as well as of the Akkadian use of *sikiltu/šigiltu/šagiltu* and *sakālu/šagālu.* In addition, *sklt* occurs twice in a document from Ugarit.

II. 1. *Conceptual and Semantic Field Outside the OT.* In Akkadian legal documents, *sikiltu* refers to movable goods that a person has "acquired" *(sakālu)* either justly or unjustly, or that a person has put aside, such as the barley stores to which Nuzi text *AO* 15541,15 apparently refers.[2] The word seems to refer primarily to the kind of reserves acquired by a person of lower standing, one either under guardianship or having only limited legal rights, through means put at his or her disposal by either a husband or father. Indeed, in the various documents under consideration, the reference is to movable goods acquired by women.[3] The Nuzi text *JEN* 435 involves an agreement between two fathers whose children are to marry.

In the Assyrian historical inscriptions *sikiltu* refers to the spoils that a person has acquired *(sakālu).*[4] In Babylonian texts the expression *šagiltu(m)* or *šigiltu(m)* seems to refer to "acquisition," or goods acquired by a person — often in an unjust manner.[5]

1. *WTM,* III, 474f.
2. See E. Cassin, "Tablettes inédites de Nuzi," *RA* 56 (1962) 75-78; CH §141.
3. CH §141; in the Old Babylonian letter *CT,* 29, pl. 43 = *VAB,* VI, 218, 31f.; and in the Nuzi texts *HSS,* V, 71, 17-19, and 74, 7-11 (cf. 66, 25-31).
4. *TCL,* VIII, 234, cf. 245; *OIP,* II, 55, 61.
5. *Ur Excavation Texts,* V, 16, 22; *TIM,* II = *AbB,* VIII, 28, 13; cf. *CAD,* VIII (1971), 305.

In the religious sphere the Akkadian usage of *sikiltu* is closely related to that of the biblical texts, which refer to the people as Yahweh's *s^e^gullâ*. The PNs *sikilti-^d^adad*[6] and *sikilti-^d^uqur,*[7] as well as their abbreviated form *sikiltum/ti,*[8] attest the use of this expression as a reference to a relationship between believer and deity since the Kassite epoch, i.e., from the middle of the 2nd millennium B.C. on. In Alalakh the royal seal ascribes to King Abban, son of Šarran, the epithets *warad ^d^IM narām ^d^IM sikiltum ša ^d^NI[N]*?, "servant of Haddus, favorite of Haddus, most personal property of the la[dy]?"[9] Cf., e.g., this enumeration of epithets with a passage from a Mari letter: *inanna anāku minûm ^lú^ṣuḫāršа amassa ūlūma šagiltum,* "what am I now? His slave, his servant, or a personal possession?"[10] These examples of the use of *sikiltum* and *šagiltum* show that the word does not necessarily refer to goods acquired improperly. The emphasis is on one's *own* possessions or one's *personal* acquisitions. It is also noteworthy that the feminine suffixes in the Mari text refer the *šagiltum* to a woman, and that the royal seal from Alalakh associates *sikiltum* with a female deity, at least if the reading *^d^NI[N]* is correct. This would conform to the legal use of the word in its frequent reference to the property of a woman who stands under the guardianship of her husband or has only limited legal rights. The inscription of the royal seal from Alalakh as well as the statement in the Mari letter must, however, also be compared with the parallel but later usage of *sglt* found in the Ugaritic translation of a letter whose original was probably written in Akkadian, and which was addressed to the last king of Ugarit, *ʿammurapi,* by the Hittite ruler. The high king reminds his vassal that the latter is "his servant [and] his property" *(ʿ[bdh] sglth hw/ʾt).*[11] The owner of the *s^e^gullâ* here is the king of Hatti. In this instance, *sglt* probably complements the general notion of a vassal relationship *(ʿbd)* by adding the nuance of a personal and special bond.[12]

2. *Rabbinical Usage.* Rabbinical usage of the verb *siggēl* and of the noun *s^e^gullâ* seems to corroborate the conclusions we have drawn from the Akkadian and Ugaritic evidence. According to *Lamentations Rabbah* concerning Lam. 1:17,[13] a shepherd who owned only a staff and a turban "exerted himself, saved *(siggēl),* and acquired sheep." By all appearances, he had not previously been working independently.

---

6. *VR,* 44, III, 47d = W. G. Lambert, "Ancestors, Authors, and Canonicity," *JCS* 11 (1957) 13, l. 47.

7. *PBS,* II/2, 13, 36; cf. *AOAT,* 11, 44 n. 5; W. G. Lambert, "Studies in Nergal," review of E. von Weiher, *Der babylonische Gott Nergal* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1971), *BiOr* 30 (1973) 356b.

8. *PBS,* II/2, 59, 6; *CBS,* 12605, adduced in *PBS,* II/2, p. 80; E. Ebeling, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur juristischen Inhalts* (Leipzig, 1927), 219, 7.

9. D. Collon, *The Seal Impressions from Tell Atchana-Alalakh. AOAT* 27 (1975), 170f.; cf. Seux, 261f.

10. *ARM,* XIV, 81, 29f.

11. *KTU,* 2.39, 7, 12; cf. H. B. Huffmon and S. B. Parker, "A Further Note on the Treaty Background of Hebrew *Yādaʿ*," *BASOR* 184 (1966) 37 n. 12; M. Dijkstra, "Two Notes on PRU 5, No. 60," *UF* 8 (1976), 437 n. 6; M. Dahood, *RSP,* II, 24f., §44.

12. Cf. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 341.

13. *Ekah Rabati,* ed. Buber (Wilna, 1899), 79.

When a son earns his own keep, independently from his father and during the latter's lifetime, then according to Jer. *B. Bat.* 9:17a, "everything he saved *(siggēl)* belongs to him." In this text *siggēl* means that the son acquires a personal balance that is not part of the parental inheritance to be distributed after the father's death. In *Gen. Rab.* 37b the noun *s^egullâ* refers to personal fortune that one enjoys counting again and again; but Bab. *B. Bat.* 52a speaks of the *s^egullâ* of a child not yet of age; the guardian must take responsibility for it as for property owned by a minor.

The allegory in *Yal. Dt.* 873 mentions two brothers who "put aside a reserve" *(m^esaggēlîn)* with the money they received from their father; and the parable in *Cant. Rab.* 7.14 cites a wife who says to her husband: "Just look what you have entrusted to me and what I have saved for you *(siggaltî).*" Finally, the rabbis explained the use of *s^egullâ* in Ex. 19:5 by comparing God with the servant or with the son or wife who "put aside a reserve" *(m^esaggēl, m^esaggelet)* with the goods of the master, the father, or the husband (*Pes. Rab.* 11 and par.), just as God makes Israel his own among all the nations.

The term *s^egullâ* has not yet been attested in the Qumran texts.

III. OT Usage.

1. *Ancient Versions.* The Akkadian and rabbinic evidence allows us to discern the meaning of *s^egullâ* in those texts in which it refers to God's people. In the Vulg. Jerome uses the terms *peculium* and *populus peculiaris* in these instances. That is, he is following the sense of *s^egullâ* in Talmudic Hebrew, since *peculium* refers to the personal possession of someone under guardianship or having only limited legal rights (cf. Bab. *B. Bat.* 52a), i.e., the property of a wife (cf. *Cant. Rab.* 7:17), a son living in his father's house, or a servant living with his master. In the meantime, this interpretation seems to offend God's dignity, and the Aramaic translators, then also Syr., use *ḥabbîbîn,* "favorites, beloved," and *'am ḥabbîb,* "beloved people," in order to circumvent the more primitive meanings. The Greek uses *laós perioúsios* (Ex. 19:5; 23:22; Dt. 7:6; 14:2; 26:18; Titus 2:14; 1 Clem. 64), "chosen people" according to the meaning of *perioúsios* in Pap. Gen. 11:17,[14] or also the expressions *periousiasmós* (LXX Ps. 134:4; cf. Eccl. 2:8), "excess," or *peripoíēsis* (Mal. 3:17; 1 Pet. 2:9), "savings" (RSV "special possession"). These last two translations approximate the sense of "reserve," without having the exact meaning of *peculium,* which in its own turn comes remarkably close to the meaning of Akk. *sikiltu(m).*[15]

2. *Hebrew Text.* In Ex. 19:5; Dt. 7:6; 14:2; 26:18, Yahweh chooses the *s^egullâ* from among the community of peoples. This imagery might exhibit a certain relationship to the myth of the divine estate or inheritance, which is divided up among "the sons of the gods" (Dt. 32:8).[16] Israel, however, would be viewed as Yahweh's personal possession

---

14. Cf. F. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden,* I-III (1925-31), Sup I (1971), II, 296.

15. See discussion above.

16. → נחל *nāḥal,* V.1 (IX, 330f.).

not through inheritance but rather through the putting aside of a reserve from the possessions of the Most High. Nonetheless, the rabbinic tradition eliminates this view of Yahweh's limited sovereignty by referring back to the end of Ex. 19:5: "for all the earth is mine" (*Pes. Rab.* 11 and par.).[17] Whatever the exact features of this anthropomorphism may be that ascribes to Yahweh a *s*[e]*gullâ*, this concept does in any case differ from that of a divine *naḥ*[a]*lâ* insofar as it implies both Yahweh's initiative and his personal engagement. This kind of acquired possession is valued more highly, and the word ultimately becomes the designation for any possession that one especially values. Thence derives the semantic nuance "treasure," which suggests itself for *s*[e]*gullâ* in Eccl. 2:8 and in 1 Ch. 19:3, and which acquired spiritual meaning for the ancient Aramaic translators of Ex. 19:5; Dt. 7:6; 14:2; 26:18.

Lipiński

---

17. Cf. R. Mosis, "Ex 19,5b,6a: Syntaktischer Aufbau und lexikalische Semantik," *BZ,* N.S. 22 (1978) 1-25.

סָגַר *sāgar;* מַסְגֵּר *masgēr;* מִסְגֶּרֶת *misgereṯ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Qal. III. Hiphil. IV. Nouns. V. Qumran. VI. LXX.

I. Etymology. This root occurs in two variations, *sgr* and *skr* (which Aramaic keeps separate; see below); both have differing meanings in the qal and hiphil: qal, "shut, close up, lock"; hiphil, "hand over, deliver." Regarding *sgr,* one can refer to Ugar. *sgr;*[1] Phoen. *sgr,* "shut, lock";[2] Aram., Syr. *s*[e]*gar;* Akk. *sekēru,* "close off,"[3] *sikkūru,* "bolt, lock";[4] Arab. *sakara,* "shut, close, lock, bolt."[5] Concerning *sgr/skr,* with the meaning

---

sāgar. J. V. Kinnier-Wilson, "Hebrew and Akkadian Philological Notes," *JSS* 7 (1962) 173-83.

1. *WUS,* no. 1890; concerning *sgrt* see *KTU,* 1.100, 70; cf. M. C. Astour, "Two Ugaritic Serpent Charms," *JNES* 27 (1968) 26; E. Lipiński, "La légende sacrée de la conjuration des morsures de serpents," *UF* 6 (1974) 170, 174; D. W. Young, "The Ugaritic Myth of the God Ḫōrān and the Mare," *UF* 11 (1979) 844, 867; also M. Tsevat, "Der Schlangentext von Ugarit," *UF* 11 (1979) 766.

2. *DNSI,* II, 778.

3. *AHw,* II, 1035; but cf. Kinnier-Wilson's etymological distinction between *sekēru,* "dam up," and *sāgar,* "close, shut."

4. *AHw,* II, 1042.

5. Wehr, 486.

"hand over, deliver," cf. Old Aram. and Official Aram. *skr* haphel/aphel, "hand over, deliver," and Phoen. *sgr* yiphʿil, "deliver."[6] The term *skr,* "bargain for, buy" (Ezr. 4:5), is a late secondary form of → שׂכר *śkr.* The form *masgēr* occurs in the emph. in the Aramaic ostracon 44, with the meaning "prison," amplified by the mention of "bread and water" (l. 3) as the food given those who are incarcerated.[7]

II. Qal. The qal form is used first quite concretely, referring to closing a door (Gen. 19:6,10; Jgs. 3:23, here together with *nāʿal,* "lock"; 2 K. 4:4f.,21f.; 6:32; Neh. 6:10, the doors of the temple; 2 Ch. 28:24; 29:7, the temple or *ʾûlām;* similarly the niphal in Neh. 13:19). Mal. 1:10 also speaks of the temple doors, insisting that it is better to close these doors than to allow a foreign cult at the altar. The closing of the temple doors in 2 Chronicles is to be understood as a polemical act against the Yahweh religion, just as in a reverse fashion the opening of the doors of the house of God in 1 S. 3:15 is to be understood as a reopening or redisclosure of the divine source of revelation.[8] The closed doors in Eccl. 12:4 are probably a metaphor for closed ears as an image of the weak hearing of an aging person.[9] Similarly, like doors, city gates are also closed (Josh. 2:5,7; Ezk. 44:1f.; 46:1,12). Josh. 6:1 represents a special case in its assertion that Jericho was *sōgeret ûmᵉsuggeret,* "shut up from within and from without because of the people of Israel; none went out, and none came in." As M. Noth correctly suspects, this represents a fixed expression, literally "blocking (the way in) and blocked (to anyone trying to get out)."[10] In Ex. 14:3 *sāgar* is used without any explicit object and together with *ʿal;* Pharaoh believes that the Israelites are wandering about aimlessly in the land; the wilderness has "shut them in," has closed off their way.

Niphal forms occur in 1 S. 23:7, where Saul believes that David has closed himself in by retreating into a fortified city, and Ezk. 3:24, where the prophet is to shut himself up inside his house.

The term *sgr* occurs several times with this concrete meaning within theologically significant contexts. According to Gen. 7:16, God closes the door of the ark behind Noah (in contrast, Gilgamesh himself does this in the Gilgamesh epic).[11] Isa. 26:20 instructs the people to go into their chambers, shut the doors, and hide until the wrath is past, a possible allusion to the Flood narrative. In Isa. 45:1 Cyrus receives assurance that Yahweh will open all doors for him, so that no gate will be closed to him, thus smoothing his way to world dominion. Hence Cyrus appears as the instrument with

---

6. For Aramaic see *DNSI,* II, 786. For Phoenician see *DNSI,* II, 778; *KAI,* 14:21; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 341: "imprison."

7. Clermont-Ganneau; cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, "Un ostracon araméen inédit d'Éléphantine (collection Clermont-Ganneau nº 44)," *Hebrew and Semitic Studies. FS G. R. Driver* (Oxford, 1963), 54, 56.

8. Cf. J. G. Janzen, "'Samuel opened the doors of the house of Yahweh' (I Samuel 3.15)," *JSOT* 26 (1983) 89-96.

9. A different view is taken by A. Lauha, *Kohelet. BK* XIX (1978), 212: the lips (the old person) fall silent because he hears nothing.

10. *Das Buch Josua. HAT* VII (³1971), 16.

11. Gilg. XI, 93.

which Yahweh intends to liberate his people. Isa. 60:11 foresees a future in which Jerusalem's gates will be continually open, being closed neither by day nor by night, so that the wealth of the nations can be brought in. Job 12:14 describes God's omnipotence by asserting that what he tears down, none can rebuild; what he closes, none can open; similarly, he either sends or withholds the waters. Isa. 22:22 describes Eliakim's authority in similar terms, pointing out that with a key Eliakim will both open and shut the house of David. Job 3:10 metaphorically curses Job's day of birth, since it did not shut the doors of his mother's womb (cf. 1 S. 1:5f.).

Gen. 2:21 and Jgs. 3:22 have a different focus. In the former, God takes a rib from Adam's body, then "closes up its place with flesh." In the latter, the fat closes over the blade in Eglon's belly. The text in Ps. 17:10 is corrupt, and one should read *ḥēleḇ libbāmô,* i.e., "they closed their hearts with fat."

Examples of *skr* occur in Ps. 63:12(Eng. v. 11) (stopping up the mouth) and Gen. 8:2 (the fountains of the deep and the windows of the heavens were closed [niphal]).

In a single instance (Job 11:10), the hiphil of *sgr* is used with the meaning "lock up, confine, throw into prison"; when God passes by *(ḥālap̱),* apprehends the guilty (*sgr* hiphil), and calls to judgment (*qhl* hiphil), no one can hinder him.

The verb *sāḡar* is also used in reference to shutting in or closing off lepers. Thus Miriam is separated from the camp for seven days (Nu. 12:14f.). The law regarding lepers in Lev. 13f. uses the hiphil form (11 times); its object is the *neḡaʿ* on persons (Lev. 13:4,5,31,33) and things (13:50,54), then also the persons themselves (13:11,21,26) or a house (14:30,46).

III. Hiphil. The piel and hiphil are used with the meaning "hand over, deliver, surrender." The piel is always used with *beyaḏ* and occurs 3 times. David knows that Yahweh will deliver Goliath into his hand (1 S. 17:46). David did not kill Saul even though Yahweh had given him over into his hands (24:19; cf. 26:8).

The hiphil is used without *beyaḏ,* usually with the meaning "deliver over to the enemy." David attempts to learn through an oracle whether the citizens of Keilah will deliver him over to Saul, and receives an affirmative answer (1 S. 23:11f.). Shortly thereafter the Ziphites offer to deliver David over to Saul (23:20; cf. also 30:15).

Amos reproves the inhabitants of Gaza for having delivered prisoners of war over to Edom, probably so that they might work as slaves in the copper mines (Am. 1:6). Virtually the same thing is then also said of Tyre (1:9, though H. W. Wolff considers this to be secondary).[12] The haphel of *skr* is used with a similar meaning in the Sefire texts.[13] Ob. 14 is comparable, with its admonition to Edom not to deliver up the survivors of Judah; the parallel is *krt* hiphil, "annihilate" (RSV "cut off").

According to Dt. 32:30, Israel's fall is possible because "their Rock has sold them *(mkr),* because Yahweh has given them up" (cf. Lam. 2:7; Am. 6:8). This complex also includes Ps. 31:9(8), which N. J. Tromp, with reference to *masgēr,* "prison" (in Ps.

12. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 140.
13. *KAI,* 224:2f.

142:8[7]), understands as "imprison."[14] Isa. 19:4 uses the piel of *skr* similarly in its assertion that Yahweh "will give over the Egyptians into the hand of a hard master."

The "historical psalm" Ps. 78 asserts that Yahweh has given over the cattle to hail (v. 48), the life of the people to the plague (v. 50), and the people itself to the sword (v. 62).

An escaped slave is not to be delivered over to his former master (Dt. 23:16). A murderer who has fled into a city of asylum is not to be delivered over to the blood avenger (Josh. 20:5). When Job laments that God has delivered him over to the ungodly (Job 16:11), he apparently means that they do with him whatever they will.

IV. Nouns. Nouns deriving from *sgr* include *masgēr* and *misgeret̲;* each means "prison, dungeon," and each occurs 3 times.

In Ps. 142:8(7) the petitioner pleads to be released from prison so that he might praise God. If this psalm represents the prayer of a prisoner,[15] then it may be meant literally, though imprisonment can also symbolize inescapable distress. Tromp considers *masgēr* to be a symbol of the netherworld (see above).[16] According to Isa. 24:22, "the host of heaven and the kings of the earth," i.e., all cosmic and earthly rulers, will be gathered together "in the pit *(bôr)* and shut up (*sgr* pual) in a prison," to await the final judgment. This apparently refers to the subterranean realm of the dead. According to Isa. 42:7, the Servant of God (or Cyrus; see the comms.) is to open the eyes that are blind and free the prisoners from the dungeon. The parallel to *masgēr* is *bêt̲ kele',* "house of confinement." Imprisonment and darkness belong together, and to guide prisoners into the light means to free them.[17] Although it is uncertain whether blindness also is intended as a metaphor for imprisonment, this text does in any case recall songs relating to the accession of a king.

The 3 occurrences of *misgeret̲* are all similar. According to Ps. 18:46(45) par. 2 S. 22:46, the vanquished enemy come trembling *(ḥrg)* from their dungeons in order to pay homage to the victor. Mic. 7:17 also speaks of enemies who emerge trembling *(rgz)* from their dungeons. In all 3 passages, it would be possible to understand *misgeret̲* as "hiding place," in which case the reference would be to unconditional surrender.

V. Qumran. The Qumran texts usually remain within the parameters of OT usage. The expression "deliver over to the sword" (hiphil) occurs rather frequently (CD 1:17; 3:10; 7:13; 8:1; 19:13), and the hiphil with *b^{e}yad̲* is comparable (1QM 11:2,13; 1QapGen 22:17). The qal of *sgr* appears with *delet̲* in CD 6:12f., and in an eschatological context in 1QH 3:18, which speaks about closing the doors of the pit *(dalt̲ê šaḥat̲).* 1QH 5:9 uses it metaphorically in reference to the closing of the mouth of the young

14. *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the OT. BietOr* 21 (1969), 155. Cf. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography V," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 428.

15. So H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1989), in loc.

16. *Primitive Conceptions,* 156.

17. Also said of Marduk, see F. Stummer, "Einige keilschriftliche Parallelen zu Jes. 40–66," *JBL* 45 (1926) 180.

lions (= the enemies); cf. also the peculiar expression *sāgartā bᵉʻaḏ šinnêhem* in 1QH 5:14. Only CD 13:6 uses the hiphil to refer to excluding the unworthy from the community; 4Q512 67:2 refers to closing off houses in the case of leprosy (cf. Lev. 14:46), and 11QT 34:5 to a possibility for closing or bolting wheels in a hoist for sacrificial animals.

VI. LXX. Although the LXX uses a whole series of verbs in its rendering of *sāgar*, the emphasis is clearly on *kleíein*, "close, shut up,"[18] with its compounds *apokleíein* and *synkleíein*. The aspect of delivering over characteristic of the hiphil is accurately rendered by *paradidónai*. Similarly, the rendering of *masgēr* (*synkleíein, desmṓtēs*, etc.) and *misgereṯ* (*sýnkleisma*, etc., though twice also *stephánē*) does not deviate from this field.

Ringgren

18. Cf. J. Jeremias, "κλείς," *TDNT*, III, 744-53; F. G. Untergassmair, "κλείς, κλείω," *EDNT*, II, 296-97.

סְדֹם *sᵉḏōm*; עֲמֹרָה *ᵃmᵉḏōrâ*

Contents: I. Location of the Pentapolis. II. Etymology and Occurrences Outside the OT. III. OT Tradition: 1. Occurrences; 2. Genesis; 3. Ezekiel; 4. In the Remaining OT. IV. Ancient Versions and Later Jewish Tradition: 1. Ancient Versions; 2. Jewish Literature after the OT.

sᵉḏōm. F. M. Abel, "Histoire d'une controverse," *RB* 40 (1931) 388-400; S. Ahituv, "סדום ועמורה," *EMiqr*, V, 998-1002; W. F. Albright, "The Archaeological Results of an Expedition to Moab and the Dead Sea," *BASOR* 14 (1924) 2-12; M. C. Astour, "Political and Cosmic Symbolism in Genesis 14 and in Its Babylonian Sources," *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations*, ed. A. Altmann (Cambridge, Mass., 1966), 65-112; M. Blanckenhorn, "Entstehung und Geschichte des Todten Meeres," *ZDPV* 19 (1896) 1-59; idem, "Noch einmal Sodom und Gomorrha," *ZDPV* 21 (1898) 65-83; idem, *Das Tote Meer und der Untergang von Sodom und Gomorrha* (Berlin, 1898); J. Blenkinsopp, "Abraham and the Righteous of Sodom," *JJS* 33 (1982) 119-32; F. G. Clapp, "The Site of Sodom and Gomorrah," *American Journal of Archaeology* 40 (1936) 323-44; F. Cornelius, "Genesis XIV," *ZAW* 72 (1960) 1-7; J. A. Emerton, "Some False Clues in the Study of Genesis XIV," *VT* 21 (1971) 24-47; idem, "The Riddle of Genesis XIV," *VT* 21 (1971) 403-39; E. Haag, *Abraham and Lot in Gen 18–19. AOAT* 212 (1981), 173-99; J. Penrose Harland, "Sodom and Gomorrah," *BA* 5 (1942) 17-32; 6 (1943) 41-54; W. C. van Hattem, "Once Again: Sodom and Gomorrah," *BA* 44 (1981) 87-92; L. Heidet, "Pentapole," *DB*, V, 46-50; idem, "Sodome," *DB*, V, 1819f.; L. R. Helyer, "The Separation of Abram and Lot: Its Significance in the Patriarchal Narratives," *JSOT* 26 (1983) 77-88; F. L. Hossfeld, "Einheit und

I. Location of the Pentapolis. The designation "Pentapolis" as a reference to the five cities mentioned in Gen. 14:2, of which Sodom and Gomorrah are the best known, is found in Wis. 10:6, though the exact geographical location of these cities is still unknown.[1] Two basic hypotheses address the question of this location.[2] The first locates the sites north of the Dead Sea, the second at its southern end, though the exact locations at the southern part of the sea vary. As many have thought since the Hellenistic age, did four of the five cities mentioned in the OT sink in the shallow waters south of the peninsula of el-Lisan? Can one still find remnants of the legendary cities in the ruins of old settlements southeast of the sea (e.g., at Bab edh-Dhraʿ)? Or are they to be found on the southwestern shore near Jebel Usdum (Har Sedom)? The southern hypothesis has long been considered more reliable, since Zoara, a Hellenistic-Byzantine city (Khirbet Sheikh ʿIsa) at the edge of Ghor eṣ-Ṣafijah,[3] was viewed as the OT city of Zoar, in whose vicinity, according to OT accounts, the other cities must have been located. The OT accounts, however, are not unequivocal, and arguments can be presented both for and against each hypothesis.[4] Furthermore, the reliability of the OT accounts stands or falls according to the historical validity one attributes to them. In any event, attempts have been made again and again to adduce not only biblical but also classical, geological, and archaeological evidence in locating the Pentapolis, though thus far without any success in identifying the location of the cities.

On the one hand, Gen. 13:10ff. might be adduced in locating the Pentapolis north of the Dead Sea and the place where the Jordan flows into it — present-day el-Ghor, in antiquity Arabah (situated outside Canaan).[5] The reference is *kikkar hayyardēn* or *hakkikār* (Gen. 13:10-12; 19:17,25,28f.; Dt. 34:3; 2 S. 18:23; 1 K. 7:46; 2 Ch. 4:17;

Einzigkeit Gottes im frühen Jahwismus," *Im Gespräch mit dem dreieinigen Gott. FS W. Breuning* (Düsseldorf, 1985), 57-74; O. Keel and M. Küchler, *Orte und Landschaften der Bibel,* II (Zurich/Cologne/Göttingen, 1982), 247-57; R. Koeppel, "Uferstudien am Toten Meer: Naturwissenschaftliches zur Lage der Pentapolis und zur Deutung von Tell Ghassūl," *Bibl* 13 (1932) 6-27; R. Kraetzschmar, "Der Mythus von Sodoms Ende," *ZAW* 17 (1897) 81-92; M.-J. Lagrange, "Le site de Sodome d'après les textes," *RB* 41 (1932) 489-514; M. J. Mulder, *Het meisje von Sodom: De targumim op Genesis 18:20,21 tussen bijbeltekst en haggada* (Kampen, 1970; ²1975); A. Neher, "Ezéchiel, rédempteur de Sodome," *RHPR* 59 (1979) 483-90; E. Power, "The Site of the Pentapolis," *Bibl* 11 (1930) 23-62, 149-82; H. Shanks, "Have Sodom and Gomorrah Been Found?" *BAR* 6/5 (1980) 26-26; J. Simons, "Two Notes on the Problem of the Pentapolis," *OTS* 5 (1948) 92-117; L. H. Vincent, "Ghassoul et la Pentapole biblique," *RB* 44 (1935) 235-44; A. H. van Zyl, "Die ligging van Sodom en Gomorra volgens Genesis 14," *HerTS* 14 (1958/59) 82-87.

1. Cf. Heidet.
2. Cf. esp. J. Simons, *GTTOT,* §§404-14.
3. Ibid., §411; cf. already the Madeba map from the 6th century.
4. Cf., e.g., Power, Clapp, Harland, and J. Simons, *Opgravingen in Palestina* (Roermond-Maaseik, n.d. [1935]), 125-43.
5. See M. Weippert, "Canaan, Conquest and Settlement of," *IDBSup,* 125f. A different view is taken by Vincent, 244; Ahituv, 998.

Neh. 3:22; 12:28), sometimes restricted to the area of the southern part of the Jordan depression (approximately from Qarn Ṣarṭabe [Alexandreion] to where the Jordan flows into the Dead Sea),[6] the alleged location of the cities. On the other hand, some OT texts suggest that the Pentapolis is located at the southern end of the Dead Sea. For example, the gloss in Gen. 14:3 is probably equating the *'ēmeq haśśidîm* (cf. 14:8,10) with the shallow southern part of the Dead Sea.[7] Ezk. 16:46 mentions that "Sodom with her daughters" dwells "to the right," i.e., to the south, of Jerusalem, just as Samaria dwells "to the left," i.e., to the north. It becomes obvious that the only conclusion allowed by a precise examination of all the OT evidence is that the OT tradition itself is imprecise and uncertain. Even the submersion hypothesis (already disputed with good reason by A. Reland but then still defended by N. Glueck) is hardly supported by the OT texts, since the OT always refers to the annihilation of the cities only in a general fashion as "overthrow, catastrophe."[8]

Since the mid-19th century, attempts have often been made to locate the Pentapolis topographically on the basis of archaeological evidence (and tradition), e.g., near Jebel Usdum.[9] For example, A. H. van Zyl considers it possible that the cities of the Pentapolis were situated in a straight north-south line west of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, with Sodom, as the southernmost city, situated opposite Jerusalem.[10] Since the 1930s, the excavation of Teleilat el-Ghassul has drawn attention to a northern location for the Pentapolis.[11] On the basis of the investigations of Bâb edh-Dhrâ', W. F. Albright was of the opinion that the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, now submerged, were situated at the Sel en-Numeira or Sel-'Esal.[12] The excavations of P. W. Lapp (1965-67) at Bab edh-Dhra' and those of W. E. Rast and R. T. Schaub (since 1973) in the entire southern Ghor have found evidence of Early Iron Age settlements in which the cities of the prehistoric Pentapolis might be recognizable.[13]

It is doubtful whether we are in a position at all to identify the lost cities of the Pentapolis, since the story of annihilation is a widespread motif of legends accord-

---

6. *GTTOT,* 108-17.

7. See, e.g., Lagrange, 492f.

8. → הפך *hāpak̠ (hāphakh)* (III, 423-27). Cf. A. Reland, *Palestina ex Monumentis veteribus,* I (Utrecht, 1714), 254-58; N. Glueck, *Explorations in Eastern Palestine, II. AASOR* 15 (1934/35), 7f.

9. Cf. Clermont-Ganneau, *Recueil d'archéologie orientale* 1 (1888) 162: "undisputable representative of Sodom"; Heidet, 48; F. M. Abel, *Une croisière autour de la Mer Morte* (Paris, 1911), 82.

10. Pp. 82-87.

11. Excavation by A. Mallon, R. Köppel, and R. Neuville; for bibliog. on Teleilat el-Ghassul, see E. K. Vogel, "Bibliography of Holy Land Sites," *HUCA* 42 (1971) 80. For the northern location see Power, Koeppel; cf. Abel, Lagrange, Vincent.

12. See Albright, passim; cf. further also Harland, "Sodom and Gomorrah," *BA* 5 (1942) 31f.; idem, "Sodom," *IDB,* IV, 397.

13. Cf. Shanks; W. E. Rast and R. T. Schaub, "Survey of the Southeastern Plain of the Dead Sea, 1973," *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan* 19 (1974) 5-53; van Hattem; Helyer, 80; for further bibliog. on Bâb edh-Dhrâ', see E. K. Vogel and B. Holtzclaw, "Bibliography of Holy Land Sites Part II," *HUCA* 52 (1981) 14.

ing to which a prospering yet wicked area is destroyed by the angered gods, though pious human beings are delivered from the disaster (cf. the Phrygian tale of Philemon and Baucis).[14] "Such narratives are naturally localized at sites which occupy the imagination because of their desertion or peculiarity."[15] It is also quite possible that a great natural catastrophe during the prehistoric period, caused perhaps by geophysical disturbances, lived on in legends of the surrounding peoples (e.g., the Moabites and Edomites) and was picked up by Israelite tradition. "However, such geological considerations have not yielded any unequivocable results."[16]

II. Etymology and Occurrences Outside the OT. Like the location, so also is the etymology of the names Sodom and Gomorrah disputed and uncertain. The MT always reads *s^e^ḏōm;* 1QIsa^a^ (Isa. 1:9f.; 3:9; 13:19) *swdm;* 1QapGen (21:6,24,26,31,33; 22:1,12,18,20,25) similarly *swdm* (in 21:32, however, *swdwm*).[17] Also, *ʿ^a^mōrâ* (MT) occurs in 1QIsa^a^ as *ʿwmrh* (Isa. 1:9f.; 13:19), and in 1QapGen even as *ʿwmrm* (21:24,32). The orthography *swdm* and *ʿwmrh* probably represents a *quṭul* form, while the form of the MT is similar to an infinitive construct, since *q^e^ṭôl* goes back to a *quṭul* type.[18] According to E. Y. Kutscher, the form *ʿwmrm* (with *mem* affix) is a *nun* affix frequently used in Mishnaic Hebrew, Galilean, and Christian Palestinian Aramaic with indeclinable words ending with an open syllable.[19] This final *nun* is often rendered graphically by a *mem* (cf. *šilō^a^ḥ* in Isa. 8:6 with *silōám* in the NT and LXX), which was actually pronounced as *nun.*[20]

The etymological derivation of the names Sodom and Gomorrah are just as disputed as the presumed location of the cities. Gesenius already mentions two possibilities for Sodom: (1) *šdmh,* "field"; (2) *šdph,* "incineration."[21] Another derivation refers back to Arab. *sdm,* "tristis poenitens fuit."[22] In their dictionary, J. Fürst and V. Ryssel mention

14. As adduced, e.g., by H. Gunkel, "Sodom und Gomorra," *RGG*^{1,2}; idem, *Genesis* (Eng. trans., Macon, Ga., 1997), 212-14.

15. Gunkel, *Genesis,* 213; also O. Eissfeldt, "Sodom und Gomorrha," *RGG*^{3}, VI, 114f.; H. Donner, *Einführung in die biblische Landes- und Altertumskunde* (Darmstadt, 1976) 27; Keel and Küchler, 256f.

16. Eissfeldt, *RGG,* VI, 115.

17. Cf. M. Mansoor, "Some Linguistic Aspects of the Qumran Texts," *JSS* 3 (1958) 44.

18. D. W. Beegle, "Proper Names in the Isaiah Scroll," *BASOR* 123 (1951) 29; *BLe,* §43^b; cf. W. Baumgartner, "Beiträge zum hebräischen Lexikon," *Von Ugarit nach Qumran. FS O. Eissfeldt. BZAW* 77 (^{2}1961), 29. According to W. Borée, *Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas* (Leipzig, ^{2}1968) 27, no. 130, *qiṭāl* > *q^e^ṭôl.*

19. "The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: A Preliminary Study," *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls. ScrHier* 4 (^{2}1965) 23f.

20. Cf. the critical comments in this regard in J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I. BietOr* 18A (^{2}1971), 162.

21. *GesTh,* II, 939, s.v. *s^e^ḏōm.* In his *Lexicon manuale hebraicum et chaldaicum in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leipzig, 1833), however, Gesenius mentions only the latter possibility.

22. J. Simonis, *Lexicon manuale hebraicum et chaldaicum,* ed. G. B. Winer (Leipzig, ^{4}1828), s.v.

sdh or *sdm,* "location, place of chalk [lime]," "enclosed place," from Arab. *sdm,* "enclose."[23] Gesenius interpreted Gomorrah as *demersio,* from Arab. *ǵmr* ("obruit aqua").[24] From the perspective of the unusual root *'mr* III, "cut into," Fürst-Ryssel interpret it as "tear," "cleft, fissure," "incision." These and other interpretations of the names often proceed from the idea that the names of these cities will already anticipate something of what the stories narrate; it is thus understandable that today one is no longer so quick to risk an etymological derivation.[25]

Scholars occasionally try to find traces of Sodom and other cities of the Pentapolis in what remains of the literature of the ancient Near East, though this has not yet yielded results free of problems. Evidence from Ugarit includes *šdmy,*[26] which one can probably view "according to form as a *gentilicium* of Sodom" without being able to identify it with the Sodom of the OT.[27] There is even less occasion to find Sodom in the Ebla tablets, even though *si-da-mu*^{ki} does occur.[28] Although at the beginning of the discoveries the assertion was made that the entire Pentapolis is mentioned in the tablets,[29] this identification is now rejected, and the mention of Sodom and Gomorrah has been called into question.[30] By contrast, it is no surprise that Sodom and Gomorrah are mentioned several times in the much later Nag Hammadi codices.[31]

III. OT Tradition.

1. *Occurrences.* Sodom occurs 39 times and Gomorrah 19 times in the OT, though the latter only in connection with Sodom. Together with Gomorrah, Sodom occurs in Gen. 10:19; 13:10; 14:2,8,10f.; 18:20; 19:24,28; Dt. 29:22(Eng. v. 23); 32:32; Isa.

---

23. J. Fürst, *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT,* ed. V. Ryssel (Leipzig, ³1876), s.v. So also, e.g., W. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT,* ed. F. Mühlau and W. Volck (Leipzig, ⁹1890), s.v.; cf. Borée, *Die alten Ortsnamen,* 27, no. 130: Arab. *sadama,* "fasten, fix."

24. *GesTh,* s.v. Cf. *GesB;* Borée, *Die alten Ortsnamen,* 39 n. 5; T. H. Gaster, *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the OT* (New York, 1969), 161.

25. E.g., *HAL,* I, 290; Keel and Küchler, 254, hesitantly suggest for the pair Sodom/Gomorrah and Admah/Zeboiim a hendiadys: "covered city" and "pastureland for gazelles."

26. *KTU,* 4.244, 13; cf. *PNU,* 184: *sudumu.*

27. *UT,* no. 1742; cf. C. Virolleaud, "Les nouveaux textes alphabétiques de Ras-Shamra," *Syr* 30 (1953) 190.

28. Text 6522; G. Pettinato and A. Alberti, *Catalogo dei testi cuneiformi di Tell Mardikh-Ebla* (Naples, 1979).

29. D. N. Freedman, "The Real Story of the Ebla Tablets: Ebla and the Cities of the Plain," *BA* 41 (1978) 143; M. Dahood, "Ebla, Ugarit and the OT," *Congress Volume, Göttingen 1977. SVT* 29 (1978), 99; also G. Pettinato, "Gli archivi reali di Tell-Mardikh-Ebla: riflessioni e prospettive," *RivB* 25 (1977) 236 (cited by A. Archi, "The Epigraphic Evidence from Ebla and the OT," *Bibl* 60 [1979] 562f. and n. 19); "BAR Interviews Giovanni Pettinato," *BAR* 6/5 (1980) 46-52.

30. R. Biggs, "The Ebla Tablets: An Interim Perspective," *BA* 43 (1980) 82. See P. Matthiae's letter to the editor in *BA* 43 (1980) 134, as well as Pettinato, "Ebla and the Bible," *BA* 43 (1980) 213, contra Archi, *Bibl* 60 (1979) 563 n. 21.

31. H.-M. Schenke, "Das Ägypter-Evangelium aus Nag-Hammadi-Codex III," *NTS* 16 (1969/70) 202ff.

1:9f.; 13:19; Jer. 23:14; 49:18; 50:40; Am. 4:11; Zeph. 2:9(5). Sodom occurs alone in Gen. 13:12f.; 14:12,17,21f.; 18:16,22,26; 19:1(bis),4; Isa. 3:9 (conj. 1:7); Lam. 4:6; Ezk. 16:46,48f.,53 *(Q)*,55f. Two other cities of the so-called Pentapolis that also appear together, Admah and Zeboiim, occur only in Gen. 10:19; 14:2,8 (conj. 19:25);[32] Dt. 29:22(23); and Hos. 11:8 (Josh. 19:36 is probably referring to a city in Naphtali).[33] Finally, Zoar occurs in Gen. 13:10; 14:2,8; 19:22f.,30(bis); Dt. 34:3; Isa. 15:5; and Jer. 48:34 (conj. 48:4). What we find is that the Pentapolis is mentioned only in Gen. 14:2,8 with the names of all five cities, among which Zoar is earlier also called Bela, and the first four names occur together only in Gen. 10:19 and Dt. 29:22(23). In Gen. 10:19 (a J addendum to the Table of Nations), Admah and Zeboiim should probably be viewed as an addendum to Sodom and Gomorrah whose function is to provide a parallel to the latter.[34] Dt. 29:22(23) is probably exilic.[35] Hence one can clearly discern two parallel traditions from the evidence: on the one hand Sodom (and Gomorrah) among Jewish prophets, and on the other hand Admah and Zeboiim in the Northern Israelite context (Hos. 11:8), traditions combined only in Gen. 14:2,8.[36] A Moabite city in the Ghor eṣ-Ṣāfijah ultimately became the fifth.

2. *Genesis.* According to C. Westermann, Gen. 14 is a composition with three distinguishable units: a campaign account (vv. 1-11), a deliverance narrative (vv. 12-17,21-24), and the Melchizedek scene (vv. 18-20). The deliverance narrative (vv. 12-17,21-24) constitutes the foundation of the chapter, into which the Melchizedek scene was later inserted; the account of the campaign was placed at the beginning (vv. 1-11). Abraham and Lot are not mentioned in this account. Only in this part do we find enumerations resembling lists, perhaps an account corresponding to the genre of royal inscriptions in the fashion of annals imitating the great Mesopotamian powers.[37] Within this account, lists were then secondarily inserted into vv. 1f.,8f. The Pentapolis, which in its complete form appears only here in the OT, represents a later combination of northern and southern traditions.[38] The disunity of the list is also evident from v. 10, which speaks of "the king of Sodom and Gomorrah" (the ancient translations, probably correctly, add "the king of" Gomorrah), while the other three kings are no longer mentioned. Among others, Westermann correctly sees that the lists in vv. 2 and 8 are composite.[39] It is difficult to say whether the names of the

---

32. H. Kornfeld, "Eine Konjektur betr. Gn 14,8 und 19,25: Admoh und Zwoim," *BZ* 9 (1911) 26.

33. See *GTTOT,* §335, 5.

34. So, e.g., C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1984), 524; O. Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse* (Leipzig, 1922, repr. 1973]), 16*; R. de Vaux, *The Early History of Israel* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1978), 217 n. 179.

35. De Vaux, *Early History of Israel,* 217.

36. See III.2 below.

37. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1985), 190f.; J. A. Emerton, "The Riddle of Genesis XIV," *VT* 21 (1971) 436.

38. Gunkel, *Genesis,* 214f., 274-76; Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 194f.

39. *Genesis 12–36,* 194f.

kings of the Pentapolis, which are mentioned only in v. 2, are inventions, though this is certainly possible.[40] For example, Targ^J and *Gen. Rab.* 42 explain the names in the manner of a midrash: Bera as *ben ra';* Birsha as *ben rāšā';* Shinab as *šô'ēḇ māmôn;* Shemeber as *pôrēaḥ ûmēbî' māmôn.*[41] One notices that no name is given for the king of Bela (Zoar), even though the Midrash also attempts to explain this name: *niṯ-ball^e'û dāyôrehā.* Neither does mention of the Valley of Siddim (appearing only in this chapter in the OT) provide any geographical or historical point of departure, although the bitumen pits in this valley (v. 10) might correspond to an actual geological feature.[42]

In the narrative following in vv. 12-24, Abraham's war of liberation corresponds to stories of liberation from the period of the judges, and perhaps was even composed during that period.[43] In this story only Sodom and its king still play a role, since Lot lived in this city and was taken captive by the eastern kings. In this way it can also be shown that the hero Abraham would no longer be a savior "were he to enrich himself on the spoils of the struggle."[44] Thus Sodom's king here represents the Canaanite royal city-state. The other kings have now disappeared (cf. v. 10). In v. 17 the redactor has tried to combine the narrative with elements of a campaign account, and one result is that the word *šāwēh* (v. 5),[45] which means "valley," has here become a proper name (perhaps the "King's Valley" near Jerusalem?). The function of Sodom (and of the other cities in this chapter, which was pieced together during the postexilic period) clearly differs from that in the other chapters of Genesis that mention the city.[46]

In Gen. 13 the story of Abraham's separation from Lot follows the itinerary (vv. 1-5).[47] This J narrative contains P addenda, one of which (13:10)[48] recounts that the *kikkar hayyarḏēn* was well watered "before Yahweh destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah." According to Gunkel, this addendum became necessary after chs. 13 and 18f. were separated.[49] A P addendum is also found in 13:12 (as in vv. 6,11b), and relates that Lot

---

40. F. M. T. Böhl, *Opera Minora; studies en bijdragen op Assyriologisch en Oudtestamentisch terrein* (Groningen, 1953), 44.

41. Cf. Astour, 74f.

42. K. Baltzer, "Asphalt," *BHHW,* I, 141; *EMiqr,* III, 187ff. Westermann follows the assumption of Nöldeke and Wellhausen that the text originally read *hšdym,* i.e., "valley of the demons." Cf. also Astour, 106, who follows *KBL*^{1}.

43. So Emerton, *VT* 21 (1971) 432ff.; Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 203; see also S. Niditch, "The 'Sodomite' Theme in Judges 19–20: Family, Community, and Social Disintegration," *CBQ* 44 (1982) 365-78. On the redaction history of Gen. 14:17-24, cf. also M. Peter, "Redaktionsgeschichte von Gen. xiv 17-24," *VT* 29 (1979) 114-20; and P. Theophilus, "The Interpretation of Gen. 14:17-24" (diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1979).

44. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 201.

45. Cf. also J. T. Milik, "'Saint-Thomas de Phordêsa' et Gen. 14,17," *Bibl* 42 (1961) 81ff.

46. Concerning Gen. 14, cf. also N.-E. A. Andreasen, "Gen 14 in Its Near Eastern Context," *Scripture in Context: Essays on the Comparative Method. PTMS* 34 (1980), 59-77.

47. Concerning the meaning of this chapter, see also Helyer, 77-88.

48. Cf. Eissfeldt, *Hexateuch-Synopse,* in loc.; Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* in loc.

49. *Genesis,* 174.

settled in the cities of the *kikkār* "and moved his tent as far as Sodom" (perhaps the text is saying that he was outside Canaan).[50] This addendum is then followed by the assertion (elaborated in Gen. 18f.) that the inhabitants of Sodom were extremely wicked and sinned against Yahweh. Here the wickedness of the Sodomites has already become a "sin against Yahweh," and as also in ch. 19, the word *rāʿîm* alludes to the Flood narrative in Gen. 6:6 and 8:21.[51] Now, if the wickedness of the Sodomites is already anticipated, it can become an example in Gen. 18f. to explain God's justice in the disposition of history.[52] R. Kraetzschmar already showed that the narratives in Gen. 18f. in which Sodom and Gomorrah play a role come from an independent circle of traditions and were only secondarily combined with the Abraham narratives.[53] Deriving from local tradition around the Dead Sea, the account of a catastrophe affecting Sodom (and Gomorrah) existed independently at first and was then expanded into an exemplary case in the Abraham-Lot narratives.[54]

Gen. 18:16-33 contains a dialogue between Yahweh and Abraham concerning whether Sodom should be destroyed.[55] After the annihilation of Sodom (and Gomorrah) is announced in vv. 17-21, Abraham candidly raises objections against the divine decree (vv. 23-32).[56] Vv. 20f. fit well as a continuation of the narrative in 13:13, and can be viewed as the "oldest bedrock,"[57] originally having no relationship to Abraham. Stylistically, too, these sentences diverge markedly from those surrounding them, which are determined more by "theological reflection."[58] God's intervention against the cities was provoked by complaints about their wickedness. Although Abraham does try, in a play of question and answer, to reach some clarity concerning the theologically important question whether God really does intend to sweep away the righteous along with the wicked, the judgment on Sodom is unalterable, and is carried out in ch. 19.[59] In this chapter "annihilation by water corresponds to annihilation by fire; local features, however, are in evidence in the latter."[60] The experience of some prehistoric catastrophe is extremely deep, and also constitutes the core that contributed to the development of this narrative.[61] The structure of Gen. 19 (iniquity — divine judgment — deliverance of one person) recurs in varied forms not only within Israel itself (cf. Jgs. 19:15-25) but outside Israel as well. According to J, the iniquity in Gen. 19 consists especially in sexual license, human hubris, and a transgression against hospital-

---

50. See Helyer, 79f.
51. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 178.
52. Ibid., 287.
53. Similarly Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 299.
54. See I above.
55. Concerning the literary-critical analysis of chs. 18f., cf. Haag and Hossfeld.
56. Concerning the midrashic character of these verses, cf. Blenkinsopp, 121f.; on their late dating, cf. Haag and Hossfeld.
57. O. Procksch, *Die Genesis. KAT* I (^{3}1924), 116ff.
58. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 290. On textual questions, cf. also Mulder, 7ff.
59. See Blenkinsopp, 119-32.
60. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* 297.
61. A different view is taken by Haag, 187.

ity.[62] In the remaining OT,[63] the demise of Sodom is usually mentioned in prophetic judgment texts, which include the almost formulaic expression *kᵉmahpēḵaṯ ʾᵉlōhîm ʾeṯ-sᵉḏōm wᵉʾeṯ-ʿᵃmōrâ* (Dt. 29:22[23]; Isa. 13:19; Jer. 50:40; Am. 4:11; cf. Jer. 49:18 and the discussion below). The portrayal in Gen. 19, however, does not refer to this sort of *mahpēḵâ*, showing that authors in other parts of the OT alter the tradition based on Gen. 19, and also portray "the sin" of Sodom and Gomorrah differently.[64] From this it becomes clear that "the essence of the tradition consists in the divine judgment on the cities, while the crime that gives rise to it is variable."[65] Hence the account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah represents a tradition that was independent of the Abraham story, and the numerous later prophetic references of this judgment do not necessarily presuppose the tradition in Gen. 19.

Even though the transgressions committed by the people of Sodom (and Gomorrah) that concern Gen. 19 are the kind threatening people all over the world, this particular narrative emphasizes two above all others: fornication contrary to nature (cf. Lev. 18:22) and transgression against the right to hospitality. Furthermore, "the attackers have an absolute superiority in numbers."[66] Hence it is clear that the Sodomites are corrupted "to the last man" (19:4), and after Lot and his family finally are rescued and "the sun has risen on the land" (19:23),[67] the annihilation of the two cities is carried out when God "rains down" *goprîṯ wāʾēš* (v. 24; cf. Dt. 29:22[23]; Job 18:15; Ps. 11:6; Isa. 30:33; 34:9; Ezk. 38:22).[68] Of course, this is not intended as an exact description of an individual event making possible a precise explanation of the process involved;[69] rather, it emphasizes that the annihilation of the region of Sodom and Gomorrah was carried out *mēʾēṯ YHWH min-haššāmāyim*. Only then does Abraham appear; early in the morning, at the same place where he had stood before Yahweh, he looks down on Sodom and Gomorrah and the entire *kikkār* and sees smoke rising from the land "like the smoke of a furnace." According to Westermann, "this conclusion was not an original part of the narrative" of the destruction of Sodom.[70]

As mentioned above (III.1), Gen. 10:19 is one of the J narratives of the Table of Nations that sketches out the region of the Canaanites.[71] This description of the area, however, is difficult to reconstruct.

---

62. Cf. W. Baumgartner, *Zum AT und seiner Umwelt* (Leiden, 1959), 368, concerning the motif of *theoxeny* (hospitality to a god).

63. See 3, 4 below.

64. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 349f.

65. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36*, 298f.

66. Ibid., 301.

67. According to O. Keel, "Wer zerstörte Sodom?" *TZ* 35 (1979) 10-17, this reference suggests that the story was originally to be attributed to the sun god as the preserver of righteousness.

68. See also F. Lang, "πῦρ," *TDNT*, VI, 936f., 942-46.

69. See I above.

70. *Genesis 12–36*, 307.

71. See Simons.

3. *Ezekiel.* Ezk. 16 describes Jerusalem metaphorically as a faithless wife, and in vv. 44-58 compares it with Samaria and Sodom, its neighbors living "to the left" and "to the right" (v. 46). The comparison with Sodom is especially humiliating for Jerusalem. "The specially chosen one has sunk very deep into sin, more deeply in fact than the one who was not so chosen."[72] V. 49 designates Sodom's sin with the words "pride" *(gā'ôn),* "surfeit of bread" *(śiḇ'aṯ-leḥem),* and "prosperous ease" *(šalwaṯ hašqēṭ),* while not extending a hand to the poor and needy *('ānî w^e'eḇyôn).* This represents a tradition diverging from Gen. 19, though notions of an offense to the right to hospitality and of fornication cannot be categorically excluded from Ezk. 16 (v. 50). In any event, they are not expressly mentioned. Zimmerli considers it not entirely improbable that in this divergence from tradition "simply a straightforward adaptation arising from typical social conditions in Israel" might play a role.[73] Ezekiel probably had before him a slightly different Sodom tradition than that in Gen. 19, and used it in his description of Sodom's sins. Ezekiel mentions only Sodom "and her daughters" (i.e., probably "daughter villages," as, e.g., in Jgs. 1:27), just as he also speaks of Samaria "and her daughters." Although he does not mention Gomorrah, this does not mean that he did not know of it. What is surprising is the turn that takes place then in vv. 53ff.; Yahweh will restore the fortunes of Sodom and her daughters as well as those of Samaria and her daughters, since although Jerusalem has sinned worse than "her sister," her rehabilitation is nonetheless assured.[74] Both Sodom and Samaria will return to their former circumstances (v. 55). From v. 56 we learn that Sodom was once a city of infamy, and was proverbial as such *(š^emû'â),* i.e., an instructive example.[75] V. 56 is best understood as a question, confirming only that Sodom's "reputation" lived on as a tradition in popular stories.

4. *In the Remaining OT.* In the remaining OT, Sodom and Gomorrah occur especially in prophetic judgment discourses, discourses possibly often constituting the material for traditional curses.[76] This is the case in Dt. 29:22(23), where Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboiim are mentioned together in a curse in which "the generation to come" and "the foreigner who comes from a far land" compare Israel's desolate condition with the once wasted cities: "the whole land brimstone and salt, and a burned-out waste, unsown, and growing nothing, where no grass can sprout, an overthrow like that of Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboiim, which Yahweh overthrew in his anger and wrath."[77] In the Song of Moses (Dt. 32), which theologically stands quite close to Deuteronomistic thinking,[78] Israel's enemies suppose that they

---

72. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 350.
73. Ibid.
74. See Neher.
75. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 332.
76. D. R. Hillers, *Treaty-Curses and the OT Prophets. BietOr* 16 (1964), 74ff.
77. Cf. M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford, 1972), esp. 110-16.
78. See H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 165.

rather than Yahweh have conquered Israel (32:26f.). Yahweh, however, evokes the depravity of this world of nations in vv. 32ff.: "For their [the enemies'] vine comes from the vine of Sodom, and from the fields of Gomorrah; their grapes are grapes of poison, their clusters are bitter; their wine is the poison of serpents, and the cruel venom of asps."[79]

The so-called apples of Sodom can also be mentioned in this context (cf. also Gen. 19:25, *w^eṣemaḥ hāʾ^adāmâ*). Wis. 10:7 already refers to a smoking wasteland as evidence of the wickedness of the Pentapolis, with "plants bearing fruit that does not ripen"; and Josephus (*B.J.* 4.8.4 §§484f.) also tells of fruit that while appearing good on the outside is filled with smoke and ash on the inside. It is doubtful that the imagery of the vine of Sodom in Dt. 32:32 is really alluding to such fruits from the region of the Dead Sea.[80]

In the remaining prophetic discourses, the "depravity" of Judah, Jerusalem, or of other nations, and the impending judgment are sometimes compared to the proverbial wickedness of Sodom and Gomorrah, and with the "overturn" of these cities. Am. 4:11; Isa. 13:19; and Jer. 50:40 all attest the extended formula *k^emahpēḵaṯ ʾ^elōhîm ʾeṯ-s^eḏōm w^eʾeṯ-ʿ^amōrâ.*[81] This recalls the judgment of God or of the gods *(ʾ^elōhîm)* on these cities in a distant past.[82] A somewhat shorter formula occurs, in addition to Dt. 29:22(23), also in Jer. 49:18 and Isa. 1:7.[83] Although in the latter text the MT does read *k^emahpēḵaṯ zārîm,* it is often emended to *k^emahpēḵaṯ s^eḏōm* since this allegedly fits better with *k^emahpēḵaṯ.*[84] In the community's response (in the "we" style) to the reading of the prophet's words, Isa. 1:9 alludes to the utter annihilation of Sodom and Gomorrah (cf. *š^emāmâ* in v. 7), and the following verse challenges both the leaders and the people of Jerusalem (and Judah) as *q^eṣînê s^eḏōm* and *ʿam ʿ^amōrâ* to take a critical look at their own sacrifices.[85] H. Wildberger considers it possible "that Isaiah is making more specific allusions to that which we are unable to recognize, possibly that, in those cities, offerings were presented and festivals were celebrated with great zeal, but that they made no time available when it came to taking care of their social responsibilities."[86] Isa. 3:9 reproaches Jerusalem, insisting that its partiality *(hakkāraṯ p^enêhem)*

---

79. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 198f.; according to *KD,* in loc.; Preuss, 168; and others, it is probably the "enemies" who are speaking here; according to E. Baumann, "Das Lied Mose's (Dt XXXII 1-43) auf seine gedankliche Geschlossenheit untersucht," *VT* 6 (1956) 418f., it is the "Judeans"; cf. the comms. on this issue.

80. → גֶּפֶן *gep̱en (gephen)* III, 61 (§III.2).

81. → הפך *hāpaḵ (hāphakh)* III, 425f. (§III.2).

82. Kraetzschmar, 87; and B. D. Eerdmans, *Die Komposition der Genesis. Alttestamentliche Studien* I (Giessen, 1908), 36, 71, among others, point out that this is the only time Amos uses *ʾ^elōhîm* absolutely in his writing, whereas he otherwise (52 times) uses it with YHWH, etc.

83. Cf. Kraetzschmar, 87f.; C. J. Labuschagne, "Der Gebrauch der Gottesnamen *ʾēl* und *ʾelōhîm* in den Schriften der Propheten," *HerTS* 14 (1958/59) 73f.

84. This has been the case since H. Ewald; see H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 19; a different view is taken by, e.g., L. A. Snijders, → זוּר/זָר *zûr/zār,* IV, 54 (§III.1.a).

85. Cf. Mart. Isa. 3:10, and IV.2.a below.

86. *Isaiah 1–12,* 39.

witnesses against it, and that it proclaims its sin "like Sodom." These words are often held to be a gloss,[87] though without sufficient text-critical reason. Later tradition testifies to the self-consciousness and pride of the Sodomites, while here they are presupposed. The tradition is variable and is altered according to which particular aspects of Sodom's "wickedness" the context is referring.

Jer. 23:14 relates that the false prophets committed horrible acts *(ša^a^rûrîm):* adultery, trafficking with lies, strengthening the hands of evildoers, such that "no one turns from his wickedness." Thus these prophets resemble the inhabitants of Sodom, and the Jerusalemites the inhabitants of Gomorrah. An oracle against Edom announces destruction "as when Sodom and Gomorrah and their inhabitants [better: neighbors][88] were overthrown" (49:18). This also applies to the inhabitants and the lands of Babylon (50:40) and Israel (Am. 4:11). Zeph. 2:9 contains an oracle of doom against Moab and Ammon, who according to legend (Gen. 19:36ff.) are descendants of Lot and his two daughters. They are accused of having taunted and reviled the people of God (*ḥerpâ* and *giddûpîm,* Zeph. 2:8), and will therefore become like Sodom and Gomorrah, a land overgrown by nettles *(mimšaq ḥārûl)* and a salt pit *(mik̲rēh-melaḥ).* This description of Sodom and Gomorrah is doubtlessly referring to the area where once, according to tradition, the cities were situated. Furthermore, all the texts mentioned indicate that the "overturn" of Sodom and Gomorrah was viewed as a "classic" example of the punishment resulting from an abrogation or even suspension of a covenant with the deity, with the deity employing traditional means for punishing the one breaking that covenant.[89]

It is striking that in the third part of the OT, the Kethubhim (Writings), Sodom is mentioned by name only in Lam. 4:6 (occasional allusions are made elsewhere to the wasteland and isolation of Sodom's terrain, e.g., in Ps. 107:34; cf. also Jer. 17:6). Lam. 4:6 relates that Jerusalem's guilt was greater than the transgression of Sodom *(ḥaṭṭa'ṯ s^e^ḏōm),* which was "suddenly *(k^e^mô-rāga')* overthrown, without hands trembling in it,"[90] a description underscoring the abruptness of judgment. Here the sin is viewed in connection with the disaster it reaps for the wicked.[91]

The northern kingdom of Israel probably had a tradition of the catastrophe of Admah and Zeboiim (Hos. 11:8), places later combined with Sodom and Gomorrah and localized along with them on the Dead Sea. Here, too, the focus is on a possible punishment for Israel, one that in view of "the inextricable entanglement in guilt and the stubbornness" of the people could only consist of annihilation itself.[92]

---

87. E.g., Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12,* 125; cf. *BHK* and *BHS.*

88. See Astour, 73 n. 40.

89. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School,* 111; see also Hillers, *Treaty-Curses,* 52f.; on Amos 4:11 see also W. Brueggema .n, "Amos IV 4-13 and Israel's Covenant Worship," *VT* 15 (1965) 1-15.

90. H. J. Kraus, *Klagelieder (Threni). BK* XX ([4]1983), 71, 76; cf. *HAL,* I, 297, s.v. *ḥwl:* "hands did not move."

91. J. Renkema, *"Misschien is er hoop . . ."* (Franeker, 1983), 269f.

92. J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* XXIV (1983), 144f. H. S. Nyberg, *Studien zum Hoseabuche* (Uppsala, 1935), 90, attributes the legend of Admah and Zeboiim to the *'al* circle.

IV. Sodom and Gomorrah in Ancient Versions and in Later Jewish Tradition.

1. *Ancient Versions.* Translations of the names Sodom and Gomorrah in the ancient versions generally follow the MT. In addition to the OT occurrences themselves,[93] the LXX attests *Sódoma* also in Gen. 14:16, and *Gómorra* in 18:16. The Vulg. does not mention *Sodoma* in 14:22 or 19:4, and in 13:13 reads *(homines autem) Sodomitae.*

2. *Jewish Literature after the OT.*

a. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.* The apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books frequently mention Sodom (and Gomorrah) and the Sodomites. In a prayer of the high priest Simon, 3 Mc. 2:5 mentions the Sodomites, who committed arrogant acts (*hyperēphanían ergazoménous;* cf. also Sir. 16:7, which speaks of Lot's fellow citizens). Notorious for their wickedness, they were burned in fire and brimstone, becoming thus a warning example for their descendants.

The legend of T. Abr. 6:13 mentions Sodom only as the place where Lot once dwelled and from which he was abducted. The Greek Apocalypse of Ezra (2:19; 7:12) speaks only in a general fashion about Sodom and Gomorrah as cities on which a rain of fire fell, incinerating them.[94] In 4 Ezr. 7:106, Abraham prays for Sodom, and Wis. 19:13-17 (in addition to 10:6; see I above) alludes to the Sodomites, juxtaposing them to the Egyptians. The ameliorating circumstances applying to the Sodomites were that they refused to take in strangers without further ado, while the Egyptians initially feigned friendship, then turned their guests into slaves and mistreated them through harsh labor.

Jubilees mentions the fate of Sodom and its inhabitants. Jub. 13:17 relates that Lot settled in Sodom and that the Sodomites were great sinners, 13:22ff. that the eastern kings defeated the kings of Gomorrah and Sodom, and that they killed the king of Gomorrah, while the king of Sodom fled. Sodom, Admah, and Zeboiim were conquered, with many killed after being wounded in the Valley of Siddim. The request of the king of Sodom (Gen. 14:17,21-24) is also mentioned. Jub. 16:5 only briefly mentions God's judgment on Sodom with its attendant features. The entire region of the Jordan is affected by the catastrophe as well. This annihilation is exemplary for all places in which one acts according to Sodom's "impurity" (16:6), which consists above all in harlotry, as shown by 20:5. Jub. 22:22 tells all "idol worshipers" that they will be snatched away, just as Sodom's children were taken away from the earth. Isaac's final discourses also hold up Sodom's "burning, devouring fire" as an example. Gomorrah is mentioned only once in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (T. Levi 14:6), Sodom more frequently (T. Levi 14:6; T. Naph. 3:4; 4:1; T. Ash. 7:1; T. Benj. 9:1). The Sodomites' "perversion of nature" is mentioned in connection with prostitution, etc. (e.g., T. Naph. 3:4: *hína mḗ génēsthe hōs Sódoma hḗtis enḗllaxe táxin phýseōs autḗs*).

Mart. Isa. 3:10 alludes to Isa. 1:10, where Isaiah calls Jerusalem Sodom and declares the princes of Judah and Jerusalem to be people of Gomorrah.

93. See III.1 above.

94. See U. B. Müller, *Die griechische Esra-Apokalypse. JSHRZ* V/2 (1976), 93, 100.

b. *Qumran.* Only in 1QapGen do Sodom and Gomorrah play a more or less independent role.[95] 21:5ff. relates Lot's separation from Abraham, as well as his settlement in the Jordan Valley as far as Sodom, where he bought himself a house. The story of the war of the eastern kings against the kings of the Pentapolis (Gen. 14) is found in 1QapGen 21:23–22:25. Several alterations to Gen. 14 occurring in this narrative are also in Jubilees, e.g., the notice that Sodom's king fled and that Gomorrah's king fell into the bitumen pits (21:32; cf. Jub. 13:22ff.).[96] 1QapGen 22:12ff. relates that Sodom's king met Abraham in Salem, i.e., Jerusalem, while Abraham camped in the Valley of Shaveh, i.e., the King's Valley (but cf. Gen. 14:17). Only once more is *s^e^dōm* found in the Qumran texts (3Q 14), and Gomorrah's audacity *(pḥz 'mwrh)* is mentioned in 4Q172 4:3. In both cases, however, the context has been disrupted.

Mulder†

95. See II above.
96. Cf. Beyer, 178ff.

סוג *sûg*

Contents: I. Etymology and Evidence. II. 1. OT Occurrences and Sirach; 2. Phraseology and Synonyms. III. 1. OT Usage; 2. Sirach. IV. 1. LXX; 2. Qumran.

I. Etymology and Evidence. The oldest occurrences are in the OT. Later periods also attest *sûg* II as "fence in, around," adducing support from Syr. *sāg,* "fence in, around," Middle Heb. *sûg* II, and Arab. *sayyaja,* "fence in."[1] More recently, scholars add a question mark to this etymology.[2]

II. 1. *OT Occurrences and Sirach.* In the protocanonical OT, *sûg* occurs 25 times, and once in Sirach. Its usage goes through the entire OT (2 times in Deuteronomy; 1 in 2 Samuel; 1 in Job; 7 in Psalms; 3 in Proverbs; 4 in Isaiah; 2 in Jeremiah; 1 in Hosea; 2 in Micah; 1 in Zephaniah). The qal occurs 3 times, the niphal 14 times (including Sir. 46:11 and discounting the disputed Mic. 2:6), the hiphil 6 times (not counting Mic. 6:14), and the hophal once.

1. *GesTh,* II, 940; *LexHebAram,* 547; M. J. Dahood, "The Language and Date of Psalm 48(47)," *CBQ* 16 (1954) 17f.; O. Loretz, *Das althebräische Liebeslied. AOAT* 14/1 (1971), 43 n. 10. For the cognates see, respectively, *LexSyr,* 462; *WTM,* III, 486; Wehr, 446.
2. Cf. *HAL,* II, 745.

The basic meaning is the change of direction "move away."

2. *Phraseology and Synonyms.* The following observations are significant as regards phraseology. The most frequent expressions are *sûg 'āḥôr* (11 times, niphal and hophal), then *sûg mē'aḥ^a^rê* (once, and Sirach), *sûg min* (once), and *sûg mē'aḥar.* The expression *sûg* (hiphil) *g^e^ḇûl* is also fixed. What we find is that, except for the qal, *sûg* appears almost exclusively in fixed combinations. Although Yahweh is never the subject, this does not exclude the possibility of attendant religious-theological relevance.

Whereas *šûḇ* and *'md mērāḥôq* are easily comprehensible as synonyms, others *(bgd, pš', bôš, klm, ḥpr, htt, ktt,* and *nûs)* become clearer only in context.

III. 1. *OT Usage.* a. The meaning "turn back," "shrink back," for *sûg* is attested in 2 S. 1:22 and secured by the par. *šûḇ*. The so-called Song of the Bow (2 S. 1:19-27) mentions that Jonathan's bow never returned from battle without success (cf. the variant orthography *śûg*). The relatively old passage Prov. 14:14 is guided by the fundamental belief that the good person can expect welfare according to his or her deeds, while the one who sates oneself according to one's conduct *(midd^e^rāḵāyw)* is to be classified as "one turned away of heart." It seems extremely doubtful that the reference here is to one who loves sin[3] or to one who has fallen away from God. It is more probable that one should view → לב *lēḇ* as the center of a person to be interpreted mentally ("one who does not use his understanding") or ethically.[4] What remains clear is that *sûg* refers to the shrinking back from the good, and certainly to the avoidance of what is really desirable.

In the final dialogue between King Zedekiah and Jeremiah (Jer. 38:14-32), the prophet announces a sharp threat by anticipating a lament of the women of the court (v. 22). According to this lament, the king has been deceived by his officials, and in his hopeless situation they have now turned away from him. The sense both of "withdrawing" and of "turning away" is evoked in the expression *nāsōgû 'āḥôr.*

Jer. 46:5 points much more strongly in the direction of shrinking back, indeed of headlong flight, in its account of the flight of the Egyptian army before the Neo-Babylonians.[5] The verbs in this context specify more closely the content of *n^e^sōgîm 'āḥôr: ḥtt,* "be dismayed, terrified"; *ktt,* "beat in pieces"; and *nûs,* "flee." Isa. 50:5 also involves a context in which hostility predominates: Yahweh's learned pupil (vv. 4,5a) is violently assaulted. The author moves into first position the statement that the person so affected did not shrink back *('āḥôr lō' n^e^sûgōṯî),* thus emphasizing his reliability.

The occurrence in Cant. 7:3(2) (a belly "encircled with lilies") raises considerable difficulties. The word is frequently classified according to a root *sûg* II, "fence in, around" (cf. I above). According to L. Krinetzki, *sûgâ* underscores "the notion of femi-

3. G. Lawson, *Exposition of Proverbs* (Grand Rapids, 1980), 289.

4. For the former see H. Ringgren, *Sprüche. ATD* XVI (³1980), 60; for the latter, R. B. Y. Scott, *Proverbs. Ecclesiastes. AB* 18 (1964), 97; C. H. Toy, *A Critical and Exegetical Comm. on Proverbs. ICC* (1899), 290.

5. Cf. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII (³1968), 269-71.

nine curves," strengthening thereby the enticing effect of the lilies.[6] M. Pope rejects recourse to *sûg* II and views the basic meaning of *sûg* I, "separate," as sufficient support for the sense "hedge."[7] The substance of his interpretation comes close to that of G. Gerleman, though the latter rejects any erotic focus, asserting that the issue is rather "a lyrical intensification within a decorative, pleasing framework."[8]

b. The expression *hēsîg g^e^bûl* apparently involves an extremely old *terminus technicus* referring to the shifting of a boundary (the causative, activating element, one including willful action, is always maintained). It appears certain that Prov. 22:28 has been influenced by ch. 6 of the Instruction of Amenemope. The prohibition of this fundamental abuse, one universally opposed throughout the ancient Near East, is grounded in the reference to the fact that the long valid boundary *('ôlām)* may not be moved because the ancestors *('^a^bôṯêḵā)* set it. This justification is accordingly based on family or clan rights, and one should not precipitately introduce theological judgments.[9] The insight is probably also correct that such boundaries guarantee the necessary vital living space, without which alliances and nations break apart, and indeed even peace itself becomes endangered.[10] Prov. 23:10f. juxtaposes such boundary shifting with intrusion into one's personal property, i.e., with illegal appropriation of the foundation of one's existence. Prov. 23:10f. makes explicit reference to widows and orphans, i.e., to typological social groups hardly possessing the legal means to litigate such injustice with any hope of success. "The recourse to God as their advocate is characteristic here."[11] The redeemer *(gô'ēl)* is the one who reappropriates the former family possession[12] and steps forward as legal advocate.

Dt. 19:14a stands out like a foreign body in its context because it is not characterized by Deuteronomistic terminology.[13] The core sentence was appropriated from a much earlier period;[14] although the justification does mention the organizational structures of the men of old, it shifts to a theological emphasis. God has given the land as an inheritance and as a gift, "and so the misuse of it was a violation of the sacral order."[15] In a short but incisive *'ārûr* formula, Dt. 27:17 prohibits the questioning of divine law by shifting a boundary in the land given by God, and the resulting dispossession of the vital foundation of one's fellow citizens. The characterizing feature of the capital offenses listed in 27:15-26 seems to be that they occur in secret (*bassāṯer* in v. 15). The

---

6. *Kommentar zum Hohenlied: Bildsprache und theologische Botschaft. BET* 16 (1981), 194; cf. the divergences from the interpretation given in Krinetzki, *Das Hohe Lied. Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament* (Düsseldorf, 1964), 215.

7. *Song of Songs. AB* 7C (1977), 622.

8. G. Gerleman, *Ruth. Das Hohelied. BK* XVIII (^{2}1981), 198.

9. Cf. in this regard, e.g., W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 379.

10. Lawson, *Proverbs,* 613.

11. Ringgren, *Spruche,* 92.

12. → גאל *gā'al* (II, 350-55).

13. A. D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy. NCBC* (1979), 286.

14. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 129; J. N. M. Wijngaards, *Deuteronium. BOT* II/3 (1971), 208.

15. Mayes, *Deuteronomy,* 289.

curse formula is chosen "because the curse is yet able, as an auxiliary legal device, to bring about a guarantee or realization of legal claims when other legal means fail."[16] This effect is not attained through magical practices but rather through the authority vested in clan thinking, authority enabling the clan leader effectively to exclude a person who acts contrary to the interests of the community.[17]

Hosea (5:10) associates with the fraternal war between the northern and southern kingdoms the threat to existence involved in such shifting of boundaries, shifting that the war itself had prompted from both sides. Thus this fraternal war is assessed in terms of divine law.[18] The wrath of God directs itself against this breach of the basic divine order. The observation that both Hos. 5:10 and Dt. 27:17 use the hiphil participle suggests dependence on Deuteronomistic tradition.[19]

The question arises in Job 24:2 whether this "removal of landmarks" has not already become a fixed symbol for grievous injustice, injustice perpetrated especially by the rich and robbing the poor of their basis for existence.[20] The formulaic introductory statement is concretized in 24:2b-12.

c. A different group of texts emphasizes the religious elements. The oldest occurrence seems to be Zeph. 1:6. For the "day of Yahweh," Yahweh threatens the destruction of all worship of foreign gods, e.g., Ba'al and Moloch (vv. 4f.). Although in this context the reference to "those who turn their backs on Yahweh" *(neṣôg̱îm mēʾaḥᵃrê YHWH)* might be summarizing the apostates, the parallel verbs *biqqēš* and *dāraš* militate against this.[21] Zephaniah's reproach is that these people are rejecting Yahweh as God in his divinity.[22] During the postexilic period, the observation is made several times that the Israelites are not observing Yahweh's ordinances in the promised land. The psalmist contends that they, like their ancestors, have fallen away (*wayyissōg̱û*, Ps. 78:57). As has already become clear, an element of insidiousness often inheres in the *sûg* movement; the second verb, *wayyiḇgᵉḏû*, directly describes the "insidious, malicious breach of faith."[23]

Even though the majority of exegetes follow B. Duhm in considering Ps. 14 as the precursor of its parallel Ps. 53, the context of 53:4(Eng. v. 3) or 14:3, according to which "there is none that does good," supports the assertion that *sāg* might be preferable to *sār*, which is used in Ps. 14:3 ("all have gone astray").[24]

The substance of Isa. 59:13 stands close to the latter statement. Beginning in 59:12,

---

16. W. Schottroff, *Der altisraelitische Fluchspruch. WMANT* 30 (1969), 125.
17. Ibid., 199, 206.
18. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 114.
19. F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman, *Hosea. AB* 24 (1980), 408.
20. G. Hölscher, *Das Buch Hiob. HAT* XVII (²1952), 61.
21. C. Westermann, "דרש *drš* to inquire after," *TLOT*, I, 350; contra G. Krinetzki, *Zefanjastudien. Regensburger Studien zur Theologie* 7 (1977), 50.
22. Cf. J. M. P. Smith et al., *A Critical and Exegetical Comm. on Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Obadiah, and Joel. ICC* (1911), 190; W. Rudolph, *Micha, Nahum, Habakuk, Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 266.
23. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1989), 129.
24. *Die Psalmen. KHC* XIV (1899), 53f.

the petitioners refer to their sins (*p^e^šā'îm, ḥaṭṭā'ōṯ,* and *'^a^wōnôṯ*); cf. the verbs in v. 13a (*pš'* and *kḥš,* which according to E. J. Kissane negate Yahweh's divinity).[25] The parallel line v. 13b summarizes this massive self-incrimination and enumerates its consequences. Justice was turned back (the wordplay between *nāsôg mē'aḥar* and *yussag 'āḥôr* is noteworthy), a situation paralleling the falling away of righteousness or good conduct *(ṣ^e^ḏāqâ).*[26] This breaches the social order desired by God and renders comprehensive salvation impossible.

In Ps. 80, a late preexilic lament of the people,[27] v. 19(18) contains a vow commencing with *w^e^lō'-nāsôg mimmekkā.* Even if it is possible to understand these words as a fulfillment of God's will,[28] this more likely represents the fundamental act of acknowledging Yahweh as the protector God. The grouping of vital hope and of worship of Yahweh (since they turn to his essence [name], yet also subject themselves to his authority) supports the fundamental character of this statement. In Ps. 44, a late postexilic lament of the people, one learns during the description of distress in vv. 18f. that the petitioner has neither forgotten God nor deceived *(šaqqēr)* him in the *b^e^rîṯ.*[29] This is the only time *sûg* and *b^e^rîṯ* are used in the same context, with *b^e^rîṯ* addressing the basic relationship between God and his people. V. 19(18) develops this condition of *b^e^rîṯ* fellowship in two ways: attitude and conduct *('ōraḥ).*

d. A different element of content is evident when *sûg* niphal *'āḥôr* emphasizes the passive aspect. In the unit Isa. 42:14-17, the promise according to which God intends to intervene for his exiled people concludes with a theological accent; for God's deeds also attest Yahweh's divinity and radically preclude the worship of other gods. As for the rest, *nāsōḡû 'āḥôr* (v. 17a, "they [those who worship idols] will disappear").[30] This includes a particularly shameful aspect *(yēḇōšû ḇōšeṯ).* This prophetic utterance is not directed toward Gentiles who worship other gods — *sûg* is never used for such — but rather against Israelites who during the exile have turned to graven images and other gods.[31]

In Ps. 129, a collective, postexilic lament,[32] v. 5 most closely approximates the terminology in Isa. 42:17. It picks up the "ancient tradition according to which the nations storm Zion."[33] If Yahweh does not live up to his qualification as *ṣaddîq,* which identi-

---

25. *The Book of Isaiah,* II (Dublin, 1943), 249.

26. Cf. F. V. Reiterer, *Gerechtigkeit als Heil* (Graz, 1976), 147f.

27. W. Beyerlin, "Schichten im 80. Psalm," *Das Wort und die Wörter. FS G. Friedrich* (Stuttgart, 1973), 16f.

28. J. Schreiner, "Hirte Israels, stelle uns wieder her! Auslegung von Psalm 80," *BiLe* 10/2 (1969) 111.

29. → בְּרִית *b^e^rîṯ (b^e^rîth),* II, 261 (§III.4). On the date see M. Buttenwieser, *The Psalms* (1938, repr. New York, 1969), 749.

30. Cf. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7). BK* XI/1 (1978), 265, 185.

31. W. A. Beuken, *Jesaja IIA. POT* (1979), 149; J. D. Smart, *History and Theology in Second Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 35, 40–66* (Philadelphia, 1965), 90f.; contra P. Volz, *Jesaia II. KAT* IX (1932, repr. 1974), 30f.; C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 107.

32. A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms. NCBC,* 2 vols. (1972), II, 872.

33. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 462.

fies him as both salvific and victorious, then his claim to be God is unfounded. But this cannot be! Thus one holds fast to the event focused on the future (hence the imperfect), namely, that Zion's adversaries will be put to shame and turned back *(wᵉyissōḡû 'āḥôr).*

The aspect of shame, a characterizing element in similar contexts, comes to expression in Ps. 70:3(2) and 40:15(14) in *klm,* and in 35:4 in *ḥpr.* In Ps. 70, an individual lament, the petitioner employs a verbose accumulation (*bôš, ḥpr* or *klm*) to wish shame on those who seek to do him ill (v. 3b,d), and to wish indirectly for his own justification. The formulaic character and absence of any concretely identifiable occasion for the lament suggests that older elements were picked up and fused. As regards *nāsôg 'āḥôr,* we find that this word combination has acquired an accent of disqualification and public shame for those affected. Ps. 40:14-18(13-17), exhibiting literary dependence on Ps. 70,[34] attests that during a later period this formulaic expression was still able, with no demonstrable alteration of content, to express a fundamental concern of the lamenting petitioner. Concerning 35:4, compare what was said earlier about 70:3(2).

From context one can see that *nśg* constitutes the verbal basis in Mic. 2:6 and 6:14 (cf. the comms.).

2. *Sirach.* Within the framework of the "praise of the fathers," Sir. 46:11f. addresses the "judges." Sirach asserts that each was a unique personality *(bišᵉmô);* they were not inwardly arrogant (v. 11b), nor did they go astray from following Yahweh (v. 11c), i.e., from acknowledging him (cf. Zeph. 1:6 above).

IV. 1. *LXX.* The LXX employs the following words that can be evaluated as translation terms: *apostréphein* (9 times), *aphistánai* (4), *metatithénai* (3), *ekklínein* (2), *metakineín, methaírein, apochoreín,* and *hyperbaínein* (once each).

2. *Qumran.* In Qumran the dimension explicated in III.1.c above is enhanced. The niphal of *swg* refers to apostasy from Yahweh (1QS 8:12; the hiphil of *swg gᵉḇûl* is also understood in the religious sense as "seduction" [CD 5:20]; this also includes the literal citation from Hos. 5:10, which is used with a different meaning in CD 19:15f.); such apostasy can express itself in a turn to other gods (1QS 2:11f.), and unavoidably results in curse, disaster, and destruction (1QS 2:16-18; CD 7:13; 8:1).

Reiterer

---

34. G. Braulik, *Psalm 40 und der Gottesknecht. FzB* 18 (1975), 197-200.

סוד *sôḏ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology and Evidence; 2. OT Occurrences; 3. Syntax; 4. LXX. II. Concrete Meaning in the OT: 1. The Secular Assembly; 2. Yahweh's Council; 3. Religious-Cultic Community. III. Abstract Meaning: 1. Secular; 2. Theological. IV. Qumran: 1. Abstract; 2. Concrete.

I. 1. *Etymology and Evidence. KBL*[2] derives *sôḏ* from a Semitic root **swd,* "come together, combine,"[1] though such a verb is not attested. Suggested connections with *yāsaḏ* I, "ground, found," or *yāsaḏ* II, "gather together, conspire," while theoretically possible, are less likely.[2] Hence *HAL* again prefers to forego altogether any suggestions for derivation.[3] While previous scholars considered the root to be unattested in East and Northwest Semitic,[4] *HAL* now adduces an Ugaritic witness, *KTU,* 1.20, I, 4, whose reading, however, is extremely uncertain. C. Virolleaud reads *wt'rb sd,* while also considering *gd* to be a possibility.[5] He compares the expression with *bô' b^esôḏ* (Gen. 49:6). If this reading is correct, then *sd* parallels *'d,* "assembly" (l. 2); *hkl,* "palace" (II, 1), *grn,* "threshing floors" (II, 6), *mṭ't,* "planting" (II, 7, 9), all envisioned as the Rephaim's places of assembly. A. Caquot et al. suggest the transla-

---

sôḏ. P. A. H. de Boer, "The Counsellor," *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. FS H. H. Rowley. SVT* 3 (1955), 42-71; R. E. Brown, "The Pre-Christian Semitic Concept of 'Mystery,'" *CBQ* 20 (1958) 417-43; G. Cooke, "The Sons of (the) God(s)," *ZAW* 76 (1964) 22-47; F. M. Cross Jr., "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *JNES* 12 (1952) 274-78; H. J. Fabry, "סוד. Der himmlische Thronrat als ekklesiologisches Modell," *Bausteine biblischer Theologie. FS G. J. Botterweck. BBB* 50 (1977), 99-126; idem, "Studien zur Ekklesiologie des AT und der Qumrangemeinde" (diss. hab., Bonn, 1979), 6-47; A. R. Hulst, "Over de betekenis van het woord *sôd,*" *Vruchten van de uithof. FS H. A. Brongers* (Utrecht, 1974), 37-48; E. C. Kingsbury, "The Prophets and the Council of Yahweh," *JBL* 83 (1964) 279-86; E. T. Mullen Jr., *The Assembly of the Gods: The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature. HSM* 24 (1980); H. P. Müller, "Die himmlische Ratsversammlung. Motivgeschichtliches zu Apc 5,1-5," *ZNW* 54 (1963) 254-67; H. Muszyński, *Fundament, Bild und Metapher in den Handschriften aus Qumran. AnBibl* 61 (1975); F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumrantexte. BBB* 10 (1958), esp. 76f.; M. E. Polley, "Hebrew Prophecy Within the Council of Yahweh," *Scripture in Context: Essays on the Comparative Method. PTMS* 34 (1980), 141-56; C. Ramirez, "El vocabulario técnico de Qumran," *Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas* (Madrid, 1971), 325-443; H. W. Robinson, "The Council of Yahweh," *JTS* 45 (1944) 151-57; M. Sæbø, "סוד *sôd* secret," *TLOT,* II, 793-95; F. J. Stendebach, "Versammlung — Gemeinde — Volk Gottes. Alttestamentliche Vorstufen von Kirche?" *Jud* 40 (1984) 211-24, esp. 215; I. Willi-Plein, "Das Geheimnis der Apokalyptik," *VT* 27 (1977) 62-81, esp. 70f.

1. *KBL*[2], 651. Cf. P. Humbert, "Note sur *yāsad et ses délrivés,*" *Hebräisches Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 137.
2. For the former see *BDB,* 691a; for the latter, → יסד *yāsaḏ* (VI, 109-21).
3. *HAL,* II, 745, as already *GesB,* 537f.
4. Cf. Sæbø, Fabry.
5. "Les Rephaïm; fragments de poèmes de Ras-Shamra," *Syr* 22 (1941) 2f.

tion "secret (place)" for differentiating *sôḏ*, while M. Dijkstra and J. C. de Moor suggest "council."[6]

In contrast, the root seems to be more widely represented in South Semitic. The frequently attested Arab. *sāwada*, "talk secretly," and *sdd*, "secret," probably represent secondary semantic developments (from *swd*, "to be black," or *sdd*, "hinder").[7] There is no connection with Arab. *sayyid*, "lord, master" > "princeps consilii"[8] (cf. *sūd*, "chieftaincy, chieftainship"). Our root is doubtlessly the source of later Syr. *s^e wādā'/ sûwādā'*, "intimate conversation," and OSA *maśwad*, "council assembly," the latter referring to a panel composed of full citizens of the country or of tribal princes.[9] The uncertain *swd* in the Punic inscription of Maktar,[10] with the meaning "vault of heaven," however, is related to *yāsaḏ*, "found, ground." Talmudic *sôḏ* means "secret."[11]

2. *OT Occurrences.* Aside from the verbal occurrences (Ps. 2:2; 31:14[Eng. v. 13]),[12] *sôḏ* occurs (only in the singular) 21 times in the OT, including only once in the Pentateuch (Gen. 49:6, J?), though 6 times in the Psalms, 5 in Proverbs, 3 in Job, then 4 times in Jeremiah and once each in Ezekiel and Amos. The word prefers clearly poetical language (cf. also the verbal occurrences in Sir. 7:14 [piel]; 8:17; 9:3,14; 42:12 [hithpael]), and in contrast is not part of the vocabulary of narrative literature. Correspondingly, apocalyptic literature prefers the Persian loanword *rāz* in referring to the mysteries.[13]

Attested personal names include *sôḏî* (Nu. 13:10), and perhaps already Ugar. *sdy*[14] and *b^e sôḏyâ* (Neh. 3:6, "in the counsel of Yahweh").[15]

3. *Syntax.* The following construct combinations include *sôḏ: sôḏ 'aḥēr*, "another's secret" (Prov. 25:9), *sôḏ ^e lôah*, "council of God" (Job 15:8; cf. 29:4 and the emendations suggested by G. Fohrer[16]), *sôḏ YHWH* (Ps. 25:14; Jer. 23:18), *sôḏ q^e ḏôšîm*, "council of the holy ones" (Ps. 89:8[7]), *sôḏ baḥûrîm*, "circle of chosen ones" (Jer. 6:11), *sôḏ y^e šārîm*, "circle of the upright" (Ps. 111:1), *sôḏ m^e rē'îm*, "circle of the wicked" (Ps. 64:3[2]), *sôḏ m^e śaḥ^a qîm*, "circle of merrymakers" (Jer. 15:17), and *sôḏ*

---

6. Caquot et al., *Textes Ougaritiques*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1974-89), I, 477f.; Dijkstra and de Moor, "Problematical Passages in the Legend of Aqhâtu," *UF* 7 (1975) 214.

7. For the former see Sæbø, 793. For the latter, *GesB*, 537; *HAL*, II, 417, s.v. *ysd*.

8. *LexSyr* (²1968), 463; *GesB*, 537b; cf. G. R. Driver, "L'interpretation du texte masorétique à la lumière de la lexicographie hébraïque," *ETL* 26 (1950) 345; J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the OT* (Oxford, 1968), 251.

9. Cf. Brown, 418. See also *CIH*, 601, 4; *RES*, 2959, 3; ContiRossini, 254; W. W. Müller, "Altsüdarabische Beiträge zum hebräischen Lexikon," *ZAW* 75 (1963) 312.

10. *DNSI*, II, 781, s.v. *swr; KAI*, 145:4.

11. *WTM*, III, 486f.

12. Cf. Humbert, 137.

13. On synonymity and differences, cf. Nötscher, 76f.; and Brown.

14. *UT*, no. 1741.

15. Cf. *IPN*, 152.

16. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 402.

'ammî, "fellowship of my people" (Ezk. 13:9). It occurs as *nomen rectum* only in the combination *m^e^tê sôḏî,* "men of my circle of familiar friends" (Job 19:19).

The following verbs are used with the noun: → גלה *gālâ,* "uncover (a secret)," *mtq* hiphil, "cultivate fellowship," *'rm* hiphil, "conduct a devious discussion," *bô' b^e^sôḏ,* "enter into the circle," and → ישב *yāšaḇ b^e^sôḏ,* "sit in a circle." These expressions are singular, so that the connection with *sôḏ* never generated fixed linguistic expressions. Not until Qumran is there evidence of more linguistic virtuosity in employing *sôḏ.*

4. *LXX.* The LXX has its own difficulties with *sôḏ.* Since it never uses *mystḗrion* as a translation, it apparently no longer sensed the semantic component "secret," while later LXX recensions did again (though cf. Theodotion Ps. 24:14; Prov. 20:19; Job 15:8; and Symmachus Prov. 11:13). The LXX translates 4 times with *boulḗ,* thus considering *sôḏ* as synonymous with *'ēṣâ,* etc. (cf. also Sir. 37:10), 3 times with *synédrion,* and once with *synagōgḗ,* revealing semantic proximity with *qāhāl.*

For the rest, the LXX sensed the obstinate nature of this term and used another ten different terms for it, though these must at least in part be viewed as focused interpretations. Hence the rendering of *sôḏ* by *paideía* in Ezk. 13:9 and Am. 3:7 is less the result of misreading *(yissûr* instead of *sôḏ)* than of the LXX interpretation of the prophetic office, according to which the prophet participates in God's "plan of education."[17] The rendering by *hypóstasis* in Jer. 23:22 is to be viewed similarly.[18] In addition to *gnṓmē, episkopḗ, krataíōma, sýntagma, systrophḗ,* and *hypóstēma,* we also encounter the verbal renderings *eideín* (Job 19:19) and *synedriázein* (Prov. 3:32). Even though the LXX recensions make the translation more consistent, they (like Sirach) nevertheless do confuse the issue further by inserting other terms.

In any event, these translators view *sôḏ* primarily from the intellectual rather than from the ecclesiological perspective.

II. Concrete Meaning in the OT. OT usage clearly reveals multilayered semantic possibilities for *sôḏ.*

1. *The Secular Assembly.* In what is probably the oldest occurrence (Gen. 49:6 [J]), *sôḏ* refers to the assembly of the two tribes Simeon and Levi (par. *qāhāl),* though the goal and purpose of this assembly are not clear. This concrete, collective understanding is increasingly limited during the preexilic period to smaller groups such as "circle of youth" (Jer. 6:11), "of the merrymakers" (Jer. 15:17), and in the postexilic period to "circle of friends" (Job 19:19) or "circle of the faithful" (Ps. 111:1), the latter already exhibiting a clear cultic association. L. Köhler suspects that the original form of the Heb. *sôḏ* is to be found in the "free meeting together in time of leisure . . . in the evening circle" of village inhabitants, as the "place for the handing on of the ancient wisdom of life" (cf. Ps. 55:15[14]; Jer. 15:17; cf. also the *sôḏ* of

17. Cf. G. Bertram, "παιδεύω," *TDNT,* V, 611.
18. Cf. H. Köster, "ὑπόστασις," *TDNT,* VIII, 581f.
19. *Hebrew Man* (Eng. trans., New York, 1956), 86-89.

the elders and older women in 4Q502 24:4).[19] Fohrer suggests that the term *sôḏ* expresses "the intimate fellowship obtaining within a group, and grounds the knowledge that can arise from that fellowship."[20] This indicates that the meaning of *sôḏ* was apparently always somewhat ambivalent, referring both to an assembly and to its group-specific intentions.

2. *Yahweh's Council.* During the early preexilic period, *sôḏ* was already understood theologically as well. Ps. 89:8(7) relates that God is feared "in the council of the holy ones" *(bᵉsôḏ qᵉḏôšîm),* referring to the smaller circle of Yahweh's heavenly entourage.[21] This notion — elsewhere combined with the *bᵉnê 'ēlîm* — is picked up again in Jer. 23:22, and finally is used in Deuteronomistic Am. 3:7. According to this understanding, the sign of a true prophet is membership and participation in the *sôḏ YHWH;* according to the LXX translators, prophets are taken as coeducators into the divine cosmic pedagogical plan.[22] During the postexilic period, this notion of Yahweh's throne council is developed further in Jer. 23:18[23] and Job 15:8, with Job 15:8 establishing the connection with the other terminology associated with the heavenly throne council (cf. Job 1) and with the notion of an assembly of divine beings. As regards terminology, in addition to *sôḏ YHWH* we also encounter the *sôḏ qᵉḏôšîm,* the *qᵉhal qᵉḏôšîm,* the *ʿᵃḏaṯ 'ēl,* and the *yaḥaḏ kôḵᵉḇê bōqer*[24] parallel with *bᵉnê 'ēlîm,* etc., up to *ṣᵉḇā' haššāmayim* (1 K. 22:19-21). Only after profound monotheistic purification were such Ugaritic and Mesopotamian mythological elements adopted by Israelite tradition; Yahweh becomes the monopotentate within a polytheistic council of the gods, a development accompanied by vehement terminological and theological controversies. The members of this *sôḏ* around Yahweh are kept clearly on the terminological periphery, and finally their designation as *qᵉḏôšîm*[25] even opens up the possibility that human beings also belong to this *sôḏ* (cf. Job 15:8; Ps. 89:8[7]), though this involves primarily the prophets (1 K. 22:19-22; Isa. 6; 40:1-8; Jer. 23:18,22; Am. 3:7). In the postexilic Ps. 25:14 every limitation is suspended, and Yahweh's throne council is democratized to the point that every person "who fears Yahweh" is able to participate in his *sôḏ.* This democratization constitutes an important stage in the semantic transition of *sôḏ* into a reference to the OT cultic community.[26]

Yahweh's throne council has three functions: (a) demonstration of Yahweh's omnipotence in the form of accompaniment (Dt. 33:2), praise (Job 38:7; Ps. 19:2[1]; 29:1f.), fear (Ps. 89:7f.[6f.]), counsel in the form of obedient response (Job 1f.; Isa. 6:8; cf. the

---

20. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 269.

21. Cf. H. J. Fabry, "'Ihr alle seid Söhne des Allerhöchsten' (Ps 82,6)," *BiLe* 15 (1974) 135-47; O. Loretz, "Aspekte der kanaanäischen Gottes-So(ö)hn(e)-Tradition," *UF* 7 (1975) 586-89.

22. See I.4 above.

23. Cf. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973), 251.

24. Cf. *KTU,* 1.10, I, 4.

25. → קדשׁ *qdš.*

26. Cf. II.3 below.

resistance to polytheistic notions in Isa. 40:13f.); (b) mediation of Yahweh's salvific will to the world of human beings (1 K. 22; Isa. 6; cf. Dt. 32:8f.; Jer. 23:22); (c) implementation of social justice (Am. 3:7; cf. Ps. 82:3f.).

3. *Religious-Cultic Community.* After cautious probes during the preexilic period (Ps. 89:8[7]: *sôḏ qᵉḏôšîm* [cf. 1QH 4:25 par. *bᵉrîṯ*]; Ezk. 13:9: *sôḏ ʿam*), it is only during the postexilic period that *sôḏ* undergoes the definitive transition to the religious-cultic community. This is signaled especially by the expressions *sôḏ yᵉšārîm* (Ps. 111:1; cf. Prov. 3:32) and *sôḏ YHWH* (Ps. 25:14 with a completely democratized understanding).[27] The notion of Yahweh's throne council is now applied completely to the cultic community itself, which as a community of the holy, God-fearing, and upright conducts its cult in the Jerusalem temple (cf. Ps. 55:15[14]).[28] Here the psalmist laments as a particularly odious betrayal the breach of trust committed by his friend, who belonged to the same cultic community *(sôḏ)*. According to Ps. 111:1, the suppliant intends to praise Yahweh "in the *sôḏ* of the upright and in the congregation *(ʿēḏâ)*." According to F. Baethgen and B. Duhm, *sôḏ* here refers to an "ecclesiola in ecclesia,"[29] though the *parallelismus membrorum* excludes this. The expression *sôḏ yᵉšārîm* refers to the cultic congregation in whose center the psalmist praises Yahweh's mighty historical acts, a congregation simultaneously implying the entire congregation of the confessing people of God *(ʿēḏâ)*. At the same time, through *yᵉšārîm* the "communally appropriate behavior"[30] of the *sôḏ* members can be viewed as an indication of the ecclesiological valence of the *sôḏ* concept. Thus here the specifically theological use of *sôḏ* acquires contours insofar as *sôḏ* "appears in human society cast in terms of religious characteristics; in this context *sôḏ* in the sense of 'community' can refer to or even express, negatively, a hindrance to, or, positively, a means for true community with God — its religious significance in the final analysis."[31] Not only can one evaluate the notion of Yahweh's throne council as a hermeneutical model addressing the specific quality of the *sôḏ* congregation, one can also attribute at least a remnant perspective to its etymological connotation in the abstract meaning "secret."[32] A confluence of the two semantic levels, however, is first visibly actualized only in the esotericism of the Qumran community. The *sôḏ* reflects the religious-cultic fellowship from the internal perspective of intimacy among members and from the external perspective of the fear and praise of God. This comes to full expression in NT ecclesiology, though "in the NT, the concept of God as enthroned, surrounded by be-

---

27. See II.2 above.

28. On the textual problems here, cf. Fabry, "Studien zur Ekklesiologie," 26ff.; cf. also H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 521: "the delight of the cultic community in the sanctuary of Yahweh."

29. F. Baethgen, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (1897); B. Duhm, *Die Psalmen. KHC* XIV (²1922). Cf. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1989), 357f.

30. → ישׁר *yšr* (VI, 463-72).

31. Sæbø, 794.

32. See III below.

ings, has been recast so that it is the community of the end time which sings God's praises."[33]

III. Abstract Meaning. In connection with the proverbial wisdom associated with the period of the monarchy, an abstract wisdom connotation already emerges, etymologically grounded, in the sense of "resolution, plan, secret," a connotation that Sæbø, probably without justification, designates as the "more significant" usage.

1. *Secular.* In Prov. 11:13; 15:22; 20:19; and 25:9, *sôḏ* refers to that which can be viewed as the object of the discussion within a *sôḏ* panel (cf. esp. 15:22 [par. *maḥ^a^šāḇôṯ*] and Sir. 8:17). Keeping a "secret" is a matter of honor (Prov. 25:9; Sir. 42:1); a person betraying it is viewed as a slanderer or gossip (*rāḵîl*, Prov. 11:13; 20:19). One should conduct confidential discussions only with the wise (*swd* hithpael, Sir. 9:14), not with a fool *(peṯî)*, since the latter is unable to keep a secret *(sôḏ)* to himself (Sir. 8:17). The notion of *sôḏ* as a neutral "resolution, plan," with the connotation "secret," is used in reference to human activity only twice outside proverbial wisdom, referring perjoratively to the deceitful plans of one's enemies (Ps. 83:4[3] [par. → יעץ *y'ṣ* hithpael]; cf. the postexilic tone in Ps. 64:3[2]).

2. *Theological.* The theological use of the abstract meaning of *sôḏ* as "Yahweh's counsel, plan" (the component of "secret" is utterly lacking here), is semantically iridescent and is also intended concretely in every instance. Naturally, it is the basic requirement for every true prophet that he stand in the *sôḏ YHWH* (cf., e.g, Isa. 6; Jer. 23:18), not only in the sense of the notion of a throne council but also abstractly as participation in Yahweh's own immediate planning. A clearly abstract usage, however, is found in the wisdom formulation *gālâ sôḏ* appropriated by the Deuteronomist in Am. 3:7; Yahweh does nothing without revealing his *sôḏ* first to the prophet, i.e., without revealing to the prophet his salvific plan. The promulgation of these plans within the human world, however, is at the same time the essential function of the throne council.[34] In the theological sense, then, the abstract aspect of *sôḏ* represents a more or less artificial differentiation within the concrete phenomenon. The two aspects refer to one and the same thing.[35] The term *sôḏ* shares this bivalence with, e.g., Akk. *puḫru*, Ugar. *pḫr*, and Egyp. *(m)sḥ*.[36]

IV. Qumran. The texts from Qumran attest *swd* 62 times, though it frequently alternates with synonymous *yswd*. The hymnic literature attests a particularly high concentration of occurrences, while in the writings concerning the community rule the term *swd* ranks far behind → יחד *yaḥaḏ*, i.e., it has lost organizational-ecclesiological significance.

1. *Abstract.* The term *sôḏ* occurs with the abstract meaning "secret" (synonymous

---

33. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 278.

34. Cf. II.2 above.

35. Cf. Brown and W. H. Schmidt, "Die deuteronomistische Redaktion des Amosbuches," *ZAW* 77 (1965) 186.

36. See, respectively, *AHw*, II, 876f.; *UT*, no. 2037, and *WUS*, no. 2215; *WbÄS*, III, 465.

with *rāz,* 1QH 4:27; 11:9; 12:12), clearly occurring in contexts touching on the anthropological cognitive (in)capabilities of the suppliant. This generates completely new word combinations: *swd h'mt, swd 'mt wbynh, swd pl'kh,*[37] but also *swd 'nšym,* "secret of human beings" (4Q512 frs. 36-38, III, 13; cf. CD 14:10), *swd ryšyt kwl m'śy 'yš,* "the secret of the commencement of all human actions" (4Q511 fr. 63, III, 2). Like *rāz, sôḏ* takes us into the sphere of Qumran-Essene esotericism. What cannot be determined, however, is whether this esoteric connotation is consciously intended when *sôḏ* takes on more concrete meaning (cf., however, 1QH 14:18,21).

2. *Concrete.* In the concrete sense *sôḏ* expresses a specific aspect of the community in Qumran.

a. In the first place, when it is radically individualized it apparently loses any reference to plurality. In this sense it occurs within anthropological contexts when the suppliant refers to himself as *swd bśr,* "assembly of flesh" (1QS 11:7; cf. 4Q511 26:3), *swd bśr 'wl,* "company of the ungodly flesh" (1QS 11:9), *swd rmh,* "company of worms" (1QS 11:10). Similarly, he refers to himself as *swd h'rwh,* "ground of shame" (1QH 1:22), *swd rš'h,* "ground of wickedness" (4Q491 10, II, 17), or *swd 'pr,* "foundations of dust" (4Q511 28-29, 3), someone whom (according to 4Q511) God himself makes capable of praise.

b. The term *sôḏ* then also refers to various groups of people, groups that — when not referring to the Qumran community itself[38] — are consistently characterized in a negative fashion. These include the *swd šw',* "assembly of deceit" (1QH 2:22 par. *'dt bly'l*), *swd ḥms,* "assembly of violence" (1QH 6:5 par. *'dt šw'*), *swd n'lmym,* "council of the cunning" (1QH 7:34 par. *'dt šw'*). The driving force behind these groups is Belial. They gather around this "priest of iniquity," constituting thus the adversaries of the Qumran-Essene community.

c. On the one hand, *sôḏ* as a designation for the community itself is used absolutely (1QH 14:18,21f.) with the community form practiced here characterized more specifically as a *yaḥad* form of life. On the other hand, *sôḏ* enters into significant word combinations, picking up on the OT notion of Yahweh's throne council. These include *swd qdwšym,* "council of the holy" (1QH 4:25 par. *bryt;* 1QH fr. 63:2; 4Q502 19:1), *swd qwdš qwdšym,* "assembly of supreme holiness" (1QS 8:5 par. *'ṣt hyḥd*), *swd 'wlmym,* "company of the everlasting" (1QS 2:25; 1QH 7:34); cf. *swd 'wlm* (1QH 3:21; 11:11) and *swd 'lym,* "community of divine beings" (4Q181 1:2; 4Q511 10:11). Even more clearly ecclesiological combinations include the (almost?) tautological *swd 'm,* "assembly of the people" (CD 19:35; 1QH fr. 9:10), *swd hyḥd,* "assembly of the congregation" (1QS 6:19; compare 4QS^e [4Q259] with 1QS 9:18f.). In only one passage is the technical usage of *sôḏ* visible: 1QS 6:19, where the novice's access to the *swd hyḥd* constitutes an intermediate stage between external approach to the community (l. 16) and acceptance into the highest stage of purity

37. Cf. Nötscher, 76f.
38. Cf. IV.c below.

(l. 22). This stage is characterized by the purification baths and admittance to the community cult. The *swd 'nšym,* "assembly of the men," in CD 14:10 must be interpreted similarly as a designation for the community itself or for a specific panel. According to 1QS 11:6ff., this *sôḏ* has a clearly cultic orientation, understanding itself as a link between the earthly sanctuary *(swd mbnyt qwdš)* and the heavenly sphere. According to 1QH 11:11ff., the function of the *sôḏ* consists in conducting the worship service together with the heavenly beings "rejoicing together" (l. 14). Membership in the *sôḏ* leads to the elevation and renewal of those involved (1QH 4:25; 10:5) from their sinful frailty into heavenly insight (1QH 10:5), and to expiation of the land (1QS 8:5).[39] Here the Qumran community understands itself ultimately as the inner-worldly realization of the heavenly throne council on the one hand, and as the only legitimate realization of the temple itself on the other. The *sôḏ* is the congregation of the end time (1QH 3:21), membership in which one loses through apostasy and disobedience to the Torah (CD 19:35). The *sôḏ* acquires its highest ecclesiological value in 1QH 7:9 (cf. 6:26): "You have made me like a strong tower, a high wall, and have established my edifice upon rock; eternal foundations for my congregation *(sôḏî)* and all my ramparts are a tried wall which shall not sway." On the basis of the rich terminological resonance, a connection with Mt. 16:18 can hardly be questioned.[40]

Although the largely synonymous *yesôḏ* developed from its basic meaning "grounding" into an ecclesiological term (esp. in 1QS), it nonetheless belongs together with *yāsaḏ*.

Fabry

---

39. Cf. W. Paschen, *Rein und Unrein: Untersuchung zur biblischen Wortgeschichte. SANT* 24 (1970), 145f.

40. Cf. Muszyński, 215; Fabry, "Studien zur Ekklesiologie," 46f.

סוּךְ *sûḵ* → נסך *nāsaḵ*

סוּס *sûs*

Contents: I. Linguistic Evidence. II. Cultural-Historical Considerations: 1. Appearance and Spread of the Horse; 2. Cultic Associations. III. OT: 1. Secular Usage; 2. Mythological-Theological Contexts; 3. Theological Considerations. IV. Qumran.

I. Linguistic Evidence. The word *sûs* (fem. *sûsâ*) occurs in several Semitic languages. Akk. *sisû* or *sisāʾu* is to be viewed as a loanword of unknown origin. Lexical lists write it as *anše-kur-ra.*[1] It appears in Ugaritic as *śś/ssw.*[2] The Canaanite glosses in the Amarna letterts have *zūzima.*[3] It occurs in Phoenician as *ss,* in Old Aramaic as *swsh,* in Egyptian Aramaic as *swsyh,* in Nabataean-Palmyrene as *swsy(ʾ),* and in Jewish

---

sûs. W. F. Albright, "Mittanian maryannu, 'chariot-warrior,' and the Canaanite and Egyptian Equivalents," *AfO* 6 (1930/31) 217-21; A. Alt, "Die Herkunft der Hyksos in neuer Sicht," *KlSchr,* III (1959), 72-98; D. R. Ap-Thomas, "All the King's Horses?" *Proclamation and Presence. FS G. H. Davies* (Richmond, 1970), 135-51; M. C. Astour, "A North Mesopotamian Locale of the Keret Epic?" *UF* 5 (1973) 29-39; R. Bach, ". . . der Bogen zerbricht, Spiesse zerschlägt und Wagen mit Feuer verbrennt," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 13-26; M. A. Beek, "The Meaning of the Expression 'The Chariots and the Horsemen of Israel' (2 Kings 2:12)," *OTS* 17 (1971) 1-10; M. Bič, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. BSt* 42 (1964); F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal and Man in Bible Lands* (Leiden, 1960); B. Brentjes, *Die Haustierwerdung im Orient* (Wittenberg, 1965); idem, "Equidengerät: Equiden in der Religion des Alten Orients," *Klio* 53 (1971) 77-96; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Die Bannung von Schlangengift," *UF* 12 (1980) 153-70; W. Dietrich, *Jesaja und die Politik. BEvT* 74 (1976); E. Ebeling, *Bruchstücke einer mittelassyrischen Vorschriftensammlung für die Akklimatisierung und Trainierung von Wagenpferden. SDAW Institut für Orientforschung* 7 (Berlin, 1951); M. Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words in the OT* (London, 1962); K. Galling, "Der Ehrenname Elisas und die Entrückung Elias," *ZTK* 53 (1956) 129-48; H. Gese, "Anfang und Ende der Apokalyptik, dargestellt am Sacharjabuch," *ZTK* 70 (1973) 20-49 = *Vom Sinai zum Zion* (Munich, 1974), 202-39; F. Hancar, *Das Pferd in prähistorischer und früher historischer Zeit* (Vienna/Munich, 1956); W. Heimpel, *Tierbilder in der sumerischen Literatur. StPohl* 2 (Rome, 1968); M. L. Henry, "Pferd," *BHHW,* III, 1438f.; F. Huber, *Jahwe, Juda und die anderen Völker beim Propheten Jesaja. BZAW* 137 (1976); C. Jeremias, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. FRLANT* 117 (1977); A. Kammenhuber, *Hippologica Hethitica* (Wiesbaden, 1961); M. A. Littauer and J. H. Crouwel, *Wheeled Vehicles and Ridden Animals in the Ancient Near East* (Leiden, 1979); M. Lurker, *Wörterbuch biblischer Bilder und Symbole* (Munich, [2]1978); M. Mayrhofer, *Die Indo-Arier im alten Vorderasien* (Wiesbaden, 1966); W. D. McHardy, *The Horses in Zechariah. BZAW* 103 (1968), 174-79; O. Michel, "ἵππος," *TDNT,* III, 336-39; P. R. S. Moorey, "Pictorial Evidence for the History of the Horse — Riding in Iraq Before the Kassite Period," *Iraq* 32 (1970) 36-50; S. Mowinckel, "Drive and/or Ride in the O.T.," *VT* 12 (1962) 278-99; W. Nagel, "Frühe Tierwelt in Südwestasien," *ZA,* N.S. 21 (1963) 169-222; M. H. Pope, "A Mare in Pharaoh's Chariotry," *BASOR* 200 (1970) 56-61; J. A. H. Potratz, *Das Pferd in der Frühzeit* (Rostock, 1938); idem, *Die Pferdetrensen des alten Orient. AnOr* 41 (1966); A. E. Rüthy, "Reiter, Reiterei," *BHHW,* III, 1584f.; A. Salonen, *Hippologica Accadica. AnAcScFen* B 100 (1955); W. H. Schmidt, "Kritik am Königtum," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 440-61; H.-C. Schmitt, *Elisa: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur vorklassischen nordisraelitischen Prophetie* (Gütersloh, 1972); J. Van Seters, *The Hyksos* (New Haven, 1966); K. Seybold, *Bilder zum Tempelbau: Die Visionen des Propheten Sacharja. SBS* 70 (1974); L. Störk, "Pferd," *LexÄg,* IV, 1009-13; H. Weippert, "Pferd und Streitwagen," *BRL*[2], 249-55; J. Wiesner, *Fahren und Reiten in Alteuropa und im Alten Orient. AO* 38/2-4 (1939); J. Zarins, "The Domestication of Equids in the Third Millennium B.C. in Mesopotamia" (diss., University of Chicago, 1976).

1. *AHw,* II, 1051f.; *CAD,* XV, 328-34.
2. *UT,* no. 1780; cf. also M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Ug. *ssw/śśw* 'Pferd,' *sswt* 'Stute' und Akk. **sisītu?* 'Stute,'" *UF* 15 (1983) 301f.
3. *VAB,* 2, 1545.

Aramaic and Samaritan as *sûsā'*.[4] Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Syriac, and Mandaic attest *sûsyā'*; Middle Hebrew, *sûs;* Arabic and South Arabic, *sīsī*.[5] Egyptian attests *ssm.t* and *śśm.t,* deriving from Can. *sws*.[6]

The etymology of *sûs* is disputed. Derivation from Sanskrit *aśva(s)* was widely supported.[7] G. R. Driver refers to Hitt. *aššušani,* "rider," which is of Hurrian origin.[8] He points out, however, that the loss of the initial *a-* creates difficulties, and thus suggests understanding *sūs* from the perspective of a repetitive *susu* or *sisi,* either an onomatopoeic term or *Lallwort.* Sibilants are characteristic of words describing quick, impetuous movements.

The word *sûs* occurs about 140 times in the OT; its word field includes *reḵeš,* "team of horses, steeds" (1 K. 5:8 [Eng. 4:28]; Mic. 1:13) or "courier horses" (Est. 8:10,14), as well as *pārāš,* "rider" (2 S. 8:4; 1 K. 20:20), "riding horse" (1 S. 8:11; Isa. 22:6), *rakkāḇ,* "chariot driver" (1 K. 22:34), "rider" (2 K. 9:17).

The LXX renders both *sûs* and *sûsâ* with *híppos.* The deuterocanonical writings attest the word in Jth. 1:13; 2:5; 6:3; 7:2,6; 9:7; 16:3; Wis. 19:9; Sir. 30:8; 33:6; 48:9; 1 Mc. 3:39; 4:1,7,28,31; 6:30,35,38; 8:6; 9:4,11; 10:73,77,79,81,82,83; 12:49; 13:22; 15:13; 16:7; 2 Mc. 3:25; 5:3; 10:24,29; 11:2; 15:20.[9]

II. Cultural-Historical Considerations.

1. *Appearance and Spread of the Horse.* The horse is at home in Europe and the adjacent zones of Asia all the way to the steppes of Mongolia. It was domesticated in the middle Asiatic, south Russian steppes probably during the late 5th or early 4th millennium, reaching Mesopotamia then during the 3rd millennium. The northern Mesopotamian area attests the domesticated horse ca. 2300 B.C., the oldest written witness being the Sumerian Shulgi Hymn.[10] The earliest certain attestations in Akkadian texts are found in the Cappadocian Tablets. The earliest witnesses for southern Mesopotamia come from the Old Babylonian letters of the Hammurabi period; the Code of Hammurabi does not mention the horse.[11]

The Sumerogram ANŠE-KUR-RA cannot be deciphered reliably in its older occurrences; only since the Hammurabi period does it definitely mean "horse."[12] In the Old

---

4. See, respectively, J.-T. Milik, review of G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1954), *RB* 61 (1954) 594; *DNSI,* II, 795; Z. Ben-Hayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic amongst the Samaritans,* 5 vols. (Jerusalem, 1957-77), II, 538a.

5. See *MdD,* 322b; M. A. Littauer, "The Figured Evidence for a Small Pony in the Ancient Near East," *Iraq* 33 (1971) 24ff.; cf. *HAL,* II, 746.

6. See *WbÄS,* III, 474; IV, 276; H. Donner, "Die Herkunft des ägyptischen Wortes [*śśm.t*] = Pferd," *ZÄS* 80 (1955) 97ff., contra Albright, 218 n. 4.

7. Albright, 218; Salonen, 21; A. F. Rainey, *Tell el-Amarna Tablets. AOAT* 8 (²1978), 77.

8. Driver, *Aramaic Documents,* 73 n. 2.

9. E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the OT* (Oxford, 1897), s.v.

10. Heimpel, 275f.; cf. *ANET,* 584-86.

11. Salonen, 12f.

12. Salonen, 18-21.

Babylonian period the horse was a rare animal, one reserved for the royal court and cult.[13] It was not until the Kassite period that the horse came into general use.[14]

The Kukkuli text from Boghazköy, dating to the 14th century, contains prescriptions for the care and training of wagon horses.[15] It stands in close proximity to certain Middle Assyrian fragments, and this is probably a case of two different treatments of the same material.[16] Kukkuli bears the title *aššušani*, "horse trainer, stablemaster," and comes "from the land of Mitanni." The Hittite text contains numerous specialized expressions of Indo-Aryan provenance. But several factors suggest that nothing more can be concluded from these findings than that we can attribute to the Indo-Aryan groups constituting the upper classes of the Mittani kingdom a special appreciation, mastery, and probably also improvement of the horse-drawn chariots. First, the horse and wagon were already known in Mesopotamia before the beginning of the 2nd millennium, and the Hittite Anitta text already mentions chariots.[17] Furthermore, there are no other witnesses for the appearance of Aryans in the Near East until shortly before the middle of the 2nd millennium, which also renders any participation of Aryan elements in the Hyksos movement undemonstrable.[18] Finally, any derivation of the Semitic word for "horse" from Indo-Aryan *aśva(s)* has proven to be extremely doubtful. In any case, these groups influenced the concept of the nobility of the *mariannu* on the basis of the possession and the mastery of wagons.[19] After ca. 1600, the horse-drawn chariot with two spoked wheels appears as a new weapon of war, as shown by numerous portrayals from Egypt and written witnesses from many parts of the Near East and from Amarna.[20] In contrast, only rarely is the horse attested as a riding animal.[21]

Horses appear as royal gifts in the Ugaritic Legend of King Keret, this, too, an indication that the appearance of the horse had nothing to do with the arrival of the Indo-Aryans in the Near East.[22] In addition, a guide to the medical treatment of horses (composed in Hurrian) was found in Ugarit.[23] The beginnings of horse domestication in Egypt date to the waning Middle Kingdom or the early Second Intermediate Period. Terminology relating to horse and wagon, as well as the tutelary gods ʿAnat, Astarte, and Resheph, suggests Asiatic provenance for the use of horse and chariot, the transition taking place probably at the beginning of the Hyksos rule.[24] The widespread no-

13. Cf. M. Noth, "Remarks on the Sixth Volume of the Mari Texts," *JSS* 1 (1956) 322-33; a different view is taken by Moorey, 48.

14. Concerning the use of the horse as a draught animal after ca. 1800, cf. Gilg. VI, 20.

15. Potratz, *Das Pferd in der Frühzeit.*

16. Ebeling, 57f.

17. Moorey; Weippert, 250.

18. J. von Beckerath, *Abriss der Geschichte des alten Ägypten* (Oldenbourg/Munich, 1971), 31.

19. Mayrhofer, 15-27; Albright.

20. *ANEP*, no. 390; EA, 1:5; 8:6.

21. Littauer and Crouwel, 82-97.

22. Astour, 39; *KTU*, 1.14 VI, 8 and 20; *ANET*, 144 (ll. 128f.).

23. *KTU*, 1.71 and 1.72.

24. Störk, 1009f.

tion that the Hyksos overpowered Egypt with a force of chariots is, however, extremely doubtful.[25] The development of a chariot force in Egypt did not commence until the Asiatic campaigns of Thutmose I.[26]

Not until the early 1st millennium was the horse used increasingly as a riding animal, something indicated by ample pictorial evidence especially from Assyria.[27] An actual organized corps of riders does not appear until Ashurnasirpal II. Reliefs of Ashurbanipal depict the horse as an animal ridden during the hunt.[28] In the Persian period the use of the chariot finally receded in favor of the strengthened implementation of cavalry, a development continued in Hellenistic armies. The horse acquires special significance in the courier service instituted by Darius I throughout his empire.[29]

2. *Cultic Associations.* The horse already appears quite early in cultic contexts. It became a symbol for the hastening of the sun and moon in their courses.[30] The naked goddess holding her breasts appears frequently in connection with the horse. This was originally the goddess of the chariot, who in Syria blends with Astarte, who rides naked on a horse and carries a bow.[31] She bears titles such as "powerful by horse," and "mistress of the horse and chariot."[32] In Egypt during the Ramesside period she appears as ʿAnat or Astarte.[33] The two goddesses, together with Resheph, were viewed as the protectresses of the horses of the royal chariots.[34] Along with the lion, sphinx, or ox, the horse can symbolize the victorious king. In the pantheon, however, it has left hardly any traces. Only Horus exhibits any associations with the horse.[35]

Since the late 2nd millennium, the Babylonians and Assyrians venerated horse heads placed on altars. In the 1st millennium the horses of the temple precinct counted among the lower gods who were to pull Assyria's chariots, and who themselves enjoyed religious veneration. In addition, hybrid horse-beings appear on seals during the 13th century.[36]

Among the Hittites, the deity Pirwa is associated with the horse, her attributive animal.[37] Influence from Ugarit cannot be excluded, since there a goddess appears as the "mother of stallion and mare," indicating perhaps an Indo-European or Hurrian background.[38]

---

25. Von Beckerath, *Abriss,* 31.
26. Van Seters, 184.
27. *ANEP,* nos. 360f.
28. W. Orthmann, *Der alte Orient. Propyläen Kunstgeschichte* 14 (Berlin, 1975), 242f., 245.
29. Littauer and Crouwel, 110ff.
30. Lurker, 235.
31. *ANEP,* no. 479.
32. *WbMyth,* I, 230, 251.
33. W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens und Vorderasiens zur Ägäis bis ins 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr. EdF* 120 (Darmstadt, 1979), 187.
34. *WbMyth,* I, 333, 338.
35. Störk, 1011.
36. Brentjes, "Equidengerät," 93-95.
37. *WbMyth,* I, 191.
38. Dietrich and Loretz, 167-69.

In southern Arabia the horse is perhaps a symbolic animal associated with the sun.[39]

III. OT.

1. *Secular Usage.* In most of its OT occurrences, *sûs* appears in secular contexts. Gen. 47:17 presupposes the presence of horses in Egypt (cf. Ex. 9:3). In Ex. 14:9,23; 15:1,19,21, horses and chariots are counted among the pharaoh's forces whose demise is extolled in the hymn (cf. Dt. 11:4; Ps. 76:7[Eng. v. 6]; Isa. 43:17). When the series *sûs — reḵeḇ — pārāšîm* occurs (Ex. 14:23; cf. 14:26,28; 15:19; Isa. 31:1), *sûs* represents the overriding concept "equestrian troop," which consists of chariots *(reḵeḇ)* with their teams *(pārāšîm)*.[40]

Josh. 11:4-9 and Jgs. 5:22 (cf. Jgs. 4:3,7,13,15f.; 5:28) speak of horses and chariots among the Canaanite forces. That Israel was unfamiliar with this weapon is shown by the fact that Joshua hamstrings the horses taken as spoils and sets the chariots on fire (cf. 2 S. 8:4).

The first use of the horse in Israel is associated with the name of Absalom. 2 S. 15:1 relates that the prince acquired a chariot and horses, apparently for symbolic purposes. Absalom was probably also intentionally breaking with the tradition according to which the mule was considered the royal mount (cf. 2 S. 13:29; 18:9; 1 K. 1:33).

Not until Solomon are horses and chariots found among Israel's own forces. 1 K. 5:6(4:26) speaks of 4,000 stalls of horses and 12,000 chariot horses, corresponding to one stall for three horses, or a chariot team with an additional horse in reserve (cf. 1 K. 5:8[4:28]; 10:25). 1 K. 10:26-29 speaks of 1,400 chariots and 12,000 horses (a peculiar ratio, rendering the first number suspect) stationed in special chariot cities as well as in Jerusalem. The context shows that Solomon's chariot strength is being judged "not so much as an effective or even necessary means of conducting war than as a portrayal of royal splendor." We hear further about the import of horses from Musri (emended text), an area in the Taurus region, and Kue (emended text) in the Cilician plain. In conclusion, a price is noted of 600 shekels for a chariot imported from Egypt (or from Musri?) and 150 silver shekels for a horse. The details of this transaction, which also allegedly included the smaller northern and eastern Syrian states, raise several questions.[41]

1 K. 18:5 presupposes horse domestication in Israel during the time of Ahab, and 1 K. 22:4 presupposes chariot troops among the forces of Judah and Israel (cf. also 2 K. 3:7 [the same expression as in 1 K. 22:4]; 7:13; 9:17-19 [mounted messengers];[42] 9:33; 10:2; 11:16; 14:20). Edifices from the period of the Omrides, initially interpreted as "horse stables," were excavated in Megiddo and Hazor; these more likely represent public storehouses.[43] 1 K. 20:1,20f.,25; 2 K. 6:14f.; 7:10 mention chariot forces in the

39. *WbMyth,* I, 522f.

40. Galling, 133 n. 2.

41. On this issue and the other passages, cf. M. Noth, *Könige 1–16, BK* IX/1 (1968); a different view in some respects is taken by Weippert, 251.

42. Cf. Mowinckel.

43. Yadin et al., *Hazor,* 4 vols. in 3 (Jerusalem, 1958-61), I, 12-14.

army of the Arameans (cf. also 2 K. 5:9 *Q*). In 2 K. 18:23 (par. Isa. 36:8), the Rabshakeh of the king of Assyria proposes to Hezekiah a wager for 2,000 horses if the king can provide riders for them — an indication that a mounted troop was known in Assyria during the time of Sennacherib.

The Chronicler's history mentions horses in several passages dependent on Deuteronomistic thinking (2 Ch. 1:14-17 par. 1 K. 10:26-29; 2 Ch. 9:24-28 par. 1 K. 5:6[4:26]; 10:25f.,28; 2 Ch. 25:28 par. 2 K. 14:20). Ezr. 2:66 notes the number of 736 horses among those returning from the exile. 2 Ch. 23:15 and Neh. 3:28 mention a "horse gate" situated at the location of the royal palace (cf. Jer. 31:40).

Isa. 5:28 mentions chariot horses in the army of the Assyrians, and Jer. 4:13 and 6:23 speak of riders in the forces of the enemy from the north, referring probably to the Neo-Babylonian Empire (cf. Jer. 8:16; 46:4,9; 50:37a [addendum from 51:21]; 50:42; 51:21,27; Ezk. 23:6,12,23 [vv. 12 and 23 are secondary]; 26:7,10f.; 38:4,15; 39:20; Nah. 3:2f.; Hab. 1:8).

In Isa. 66:20 horses and chariots are mentioned as a means of transport for those returning from the exile. Jer. 17:25 (cf. 22:4) anticipates that as a result of the obedient keeping of the sabbath, the kings of Judah and their entourage will enter Jerusalem with horses and chariots. Ezk. 17:15 relates that Zedekiah sent ambassadors to Egypt, "that they might give him horses and a large army." Ezk. 27:14 mentions draught horses *(sûsîm)* and riding horses *(pārāšîm)* from Beth-togarmah in Asia Minor, involving trade with Tyre. In the comparative style of nascent apocalyptic, Joel 2:4f. compares the enemy host with steeds, riders, and chariots. The background here is the notion of an actual army with mounted troops and chariots, as was customary during the Persian period. Am. 2:15 mentions that during judgment the charioteer *(rōḵēḇ)* will not rescue his horse.[44] Am. 4:10 mentions horses as spoils of the enemy. Eccl. 10:7 identifies the horse as the mount of princes; similarly also Est. 6:8-11; Est. 8:10 speaks of courier horses,[45] familiar from the Persian Empire.

Gen. 49:17 compares the tribe of Dan with a serpent that bites a horse's heels, causing the charioteer to fall.[46] The comparison implies that the small tribe is too weak to attack the Canaanites openly, who are equipped with chariots; it can, however, dare a sudden ambush attack. The metaphor in Isa. 63:13 relates that Yahweh led Israel "through the depths; like a horse in the desert, they did not stumble." The reality of mounted troops during the Persian period probably provides the background for this metaphor.

Jer. 5:8 compares the Jerusalemites to stallions, "each neighing for his neighbor's wife." This same notion of the stallion's passion underlies the blunt imagery in Ezk. 23:20, though here it is applied to "the power of Egyptian political conspiracy," to which Judah falls prey.[47] Jer. 8:6 compares the apostasy of the Judeans to a horse

---

44. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 171f., with reference to Galling, 131: The verb *rāḵaḇ* refers primarily to driving and only secondarily to riding.

45. H. Bardtke, *Das Buch Esther. KAT* XVII/4-5 (1963), 366.

46. H.-J. Zobel, *Stammesspruch und Geschichte. BZAW* 95 (1965), 18f.; a different view is taken by C. Westermann, *Genesis 37–50* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1986), in loc.

47. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 487.

plunging headlong into battle, running wildly out of control in the wrong direction. In Jer. 12:5 Yahweh addresses the prophet: "If you have raced with men on foot, and they have wearied you, how will you compete with horses?" That is, if Jeremiah has already failed at an easy task, how then is he to fare in even more difficult ones?

Am. 6:12 uses the horse in a wisdom riddle that presupposes the horse as an animal used with chariots, which are useless on rocky terrain. Israel's own practice of perverting justice into injustice is as absurd as trying to operate horse and chariot on such terrain.

In an admonition, Ps. 32:9 refers to the horse's lack of understanding. Only with bit and bridle can this animal be restrained, and Israel should be mindful not to act similarly.

Job 39:18 draws attention to the paradox that the ostrich, which cannot fly, nonetheless can outrun the horse. Job 39:19-25 describes the battle horse, though the weapons mentioned in the context sooner suggest the mount of the cavalry than the animal that pulls the chariot.[48] The horse also appears in a proverb (Prov. 26:3). The fool, who cannot be reached by the understanding, will perhaps understand the language of chastisement — as does the disobedient horse.

Cant. 1:9ff. compares the beloved to the mare (the only occurrence of *sûsâ*) of Pharaoh's chariot, emphasizing her comely cheeks and neck with its string of jewels. This motif suggests the influence of Egyptian love poetry, though the point of comparison there is the haste with which the lover comes to his beloved. Such praise of beauty has parallels in Greek thinking.[49]

2. *Mythological-Theological Contexts.* A mythological background underlies the rapture of Elijah on a fiery chariot with fiery horses (2 K. 2:11). Widespread interpretation associates this with the chariot of the sun and its steeds, which allegedly alludes to the presence of God.[50] K. Galling adduces Aramaic evidence, which attests a god *rkb 'l,* whose symbol is the yoke of a horse span. This god is the "master of the chariot," and is countered by prophets filled with the Spirit of Yahweh, especially Elisha (13:14) and Elijah, who receive the name "chariots of Israel and its horsemen" (2:12), allegedly leading to the motif of Elijah's rapture on a fiery chariot.[51] H. C. Schmitt finds the nearest religio-historical parallel in Zec. 6:1-8.[52] Galling's thesis is supported by the vision of the fiery chariots and horses round about Elisha in 2 K. 6:17 and 7:6f., a vision that from the traditio-historical perspective is inseparable from 2:11.

2 K. 23:11 mentions the horses that the kings of Judah dedicated to the Babylonian-Assyrian god Šamaš, and chariots of the sun that Josiah destroyed. It is uncertain whether the reference is to symbols or to living horses that pulled the processional chariots of Šamaš.[53] Hab. 3:8 speaks of the horses and chariot upon which Yahweh

48. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 515.
49. G. Gerlemann, *Ruth/Das Hohelied. BK* XVIII (^{2}1981), 106f.
50. G. Fohrer, *Prophetenerzählungen. Die Propheten des AT* VII (Gütersloh, 1977), 84.
51. Galling, 142-48.
52. P. 114.
53. E. Würthwein, *Die Bücher der Könige,* part II: *1. Kön. 17–2. Kön. 25. ATD* XI/2 (1984), 459.

storms down during his theophany; the background is the Ugaritic myth in which the "rider of the clouds" Baʿal measures himself against the sea god Yamm.[54] In contrast, Hab. 3:15 (emended text) speaks of the horses of Yahweh's enemy that are destroyed.

In Zec. 1:7-15 we encounter scouts on horses whose various colors are probably to be interpreted mythologically. In view of 6:1-8, four colors are expected, and the color black is to be added. The four steeds are related to the four heavenly directions and the four winds. The myth presents the winds as God's messengers (cf. Ps. 104:4) in the form of either birds or steeds. The colors refer to the four planets of the cosmic corners: red for Mercury, black for Saturn, white for Jupiter, and green for Mars. In this vision the light reddish color has replaced green, a concession to the natural coloration of horses.[55] A nonmythological interpretation is also possible, however, according to which the horse domestication conducted under the Persian high king provides the background for the colorful multiplicity of horses, representing thus "the majesty, power, and presence of the universal divine kingship of Yahweh."[56] Derivation of these colors from a doctrine of winds or continents[57] is probably untenable.

In Zec. 6:1-8 the prophet sees four chariots, which are to go out to the four winds of heaven and are drawn by horses of different colors (in v. 3, *'ᵃmuṣṣîm* is to be deleted as a variant of *bᵉruddîm*). The interpretation of these colors is similar to that in 1:7-15.

Reference can also be made to 2 Mc. 3:25; 10:29-31; both passages deal with epiphanies during which God comes to deliver his people, epiphanies deriving from Hellenistic religious thinking (cf. 2 Mc. 5:2-4; 11:8).[58]

3. *Theological Considerations.* The horse occurs with theological significance from the 8th century, the oldest occurrence being Hos. 14:4(3), which juxtaposes Israel's trust in its own military might with trust in Yahweh. The comparison of military power to idols, as also seen in Isa. 2:7f. and Mic. 5:9ff.(10ff.), is noteworthy. Hos. 1:7 is a Judean gloss assuring Judah of Yahweh's compassion, compassion resulting from God's freedom, "not by horses, nor by horsemen." Trust in one's own military power leads to ruin (cf. Isa. 30:16; 31:1). For Egypt too, along with its military forces, belongs to the sphere of frail, powerless humanity,[59] and is "flesh" *(bāśār),* not "spirit" *(rûaḥ;* cf. Isa. 31:3; Zec. 10:5). This same rejection of military means in juxtaposition with trust in Yahweh occurs in Ps. 20:8(7); 33:17; 147:10.

A close traditio-historical connection obtains between this notion and that of the destruction of military equipment, including horse and chariot, by Yahweh or the messianic king. This motif occurs in Mic. 5:9(10); Hag. 2:22; Zec. 9:10 (the verb should be emended to the 3rd person sg.); 12:4; 14:15. The source of the polemic against military equipment is found in the tradition of the Yahweh wars of the early period, albeit bro-

54. F. Horst, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten: Hosea bis Micha. HAT* XIV (²1954), 185.
55. Ibid., 220.
56. Seybold, 72f.; cf. C. Jeremias, 130.
57. Gese, 33f.
58. C. Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch. JSHRZ* I/3 (Gütersloh, ²1979), 187f.
59. Huber, 126.

ken "against the background of the narrative tradition of the Yahweh wars, in which Yahweh increasingly becomes the only actor, while the former warriors become mere spectators of Yahweh's activity." The view thus emerges that Yahweh and military potential are contrasted as mutually exclusive alternatives.[60] In contrast, Prov. 21:31 seems to take a "more realistic" view. "Even if preparations are undertaken ever so carefully after a far-reaching decision, success nonetheless remains the prerogative of Yahweh alone."[61]

Both the law regarding the king in Dt. 17:14-20 and that addressing war in Dt. 20 belong in this same context. Dt. 17:16 forbids the king from keeping many horses and from taking the people back to Egypt in order to acquire horses, referring probably to an exchange of Israelite soldiers for Egyptian horses (cf. 1 K. 10:28), an act that is interpreted as a reversal of the exodus.[62] Above all, however, the king is being required to renounce the arrogance of sovereign power (cf. 2 S. 15:1; 1 K. 1:5), for horses and chariots are attributes of royal power. Thus does Ashurbanipal declare on the Rassam cylinder: "chariots, horses, mules were all part of my gift to him for majestic travel."[63] Dt. 20:1 exhorts the people to trust in Yahweh, even in the face of superior, hostile chariotry.

Two peculiar passages remain to be mentioned. Zec. 10:3 asserts that Yahweh will make his flock like proud steeds in battle — a daring metaphor. The assertion is that in the final battle between Judah and its enemies, Yahweh will fight on the side of Judah. Zec. 14:20, an addendum to Trito-Zechariah, says that the distinction between holy and unholy will disappear in the end time, an assertion then taken to the extreme. Even the ringing metal bells on the horse tack, originally apotropaic in nature, will be sacred to the Lord, as sacred as the adornments on the high priest's head (cf. Ex. 28:36; Zec. 3:9).

IV. Qumran. The word *sûs* occurs 8 times in Qumran. While 1QpHab 3:10 refers back to Hab. 1:8f. (see above), and the occurrences in the Temple Scroll refer almost exclusively to OT passages (11QT 56:16f. to Dt. 17:14-20; 11QT 61:13 to Dt. 20:1-18; 11QT 58:7 belongs to the further Qumranic development of the Deuteronomic law regarding the king), very few occurrences shed any light on the Qumran-Essene understanding of horses. According to 1QM 6:8ff., horsemen will play a central role in the decisive eschatological battle. According to l. 12, the *sûsîm* used here are to be stallions *(zkr)*, swift *(ql)*, sensitive of mouth *(rky ph)*, and sound of wind *('rwky rwḥ)*. The occurrence in 6Q10 15:3 is in a broken context.[64]

Stendebach

60. Bach, 21f.
61. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 250.
62. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 119f.
63. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 108.
64. Cf. M. Baillet, J. Tadeusz, and R. de Vaux, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân. DJD* III (1962), 125.

סוֹף *sôp;* סוף *swp*

Contents: I. 1. Root; 2. OT Forms; 3. Parallel Words; Word Combinations. II. General Usage: 1. Heb. and Aram. *swp;* 2. *sôp/sôpā',* "End." III. Theological Aspects. IV. Qumran. V. LXX.

I. 1. *Root.* The root *swp* is used primarily in the West Semitic linguistic sphere; in addition to Arab. *sāfa,* "vanish," it occurs — with verb and noun — most frequently in Aramaic, Syriac, and Mandaic, as well as in OT Hebrew (usually late) and Post-Biblical Hebrew, usually with the basic meaning "cease," and for the noun, "end."[1]

2. *OT Forms.* The root *swp* and its derivatives are attested in the OT in both Hebrew and Aramaic, in both cases with verb and noun(s). The verb *swp* occurs 4 times in the qal (Isa. 66:17; Am. 3:15;[2] Ps. 73:19; Est. 9:28), and either 6 or, more probably, 4 times in the hiphil (Jer. 8:13; Zeph. 1:2-3, though these passages are extremely uncertain).[3]

Some understand the form *'āsōp* (Jer. 8:13; Zeph. 1:2) as a special infinitive absolute of *swp (hēsîp),* but most derive it as an infinitive absolute from *'āsap,* "collect," or change it to *'ōsēp;* here *'ᵃsîpēm* (Jer. 8:13) is often emended to *'ᵃsîpām,* "her harvest."[4] The 3 occurrences of *'āsēp* in Zeph 1:2f. are sometimes emended, to either *'ōsēp*[5] or *'e'ᵉsōp.* According to *BDB, 'āsōp* (from *'āsap*) was chosen because of assonance.[6] To my knowledge, however, the possibility has not yet been considered that *'āsōp* (from *'āsap*) and *'ᵃsîpēm/'āsēp* (from *hēsîp*) represent a contamination of two alternative readings, on the one hand of *'āsap* and on the other of *hēsîp.*

The verb *swp* would have one additional occurrence if a *šaph'ēl* form of this verb were assumed to be present in the hapax legomenon *wayᵉšassēp* in 1 S. 15:33.[7]

The noun *sôp,* "end," occurs 5 times, and only in later texts (2 Ch. 20:16; Eccl. 3:11; 7:2; 12:13; Joel 2:20 [as an object]).

In the Aramaic portion of the OT, both the verb and the noun *sôpā'* (*sôp* only in the construct state) occur, the verb twice, once in the peal (Dnl. 4:30[33]) and once in the haphel (2:44), and *sôp/sôpā'* 5 times (4:8,19[11,22] [with which 4:17(20) can also be compared]; 6:27[26]; 7:26,28).

---

sôp. J. Barth, *Wurzeluntersuchungen zum hebräischen und aramäischen Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1902), 32; E. Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im AT* (Halle am Salle, 1902), 67f., 96; Wagner, 87.

1. See Kautzsch; Wagner; *DNSI,* II, 796; Beyer, 645; *CSD,* s.v.; *MdD,* 323a; J. Ouellette, "An Unnoticed Device for Expressing the Future in Middle Hebrew," *HAR* 4 (1980) 127ff.
2. Mandelkern, 802, lists it under *sāpâ,* "take away."
3. Compare Mandelkern, 794, with Lisowsky, 129, 991.
4. See the comms.; *GesB,* 539; *HAL,* I, 74.
5. *GK,* §72aa.
6. *BDB,* 692.
7. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography XI," *Bibl* 54 (1973) 363, following G. J. Thierry and L. Wächter.

3. *Parallel Words; Word Combinations.* In some passages this group has direct parallel words, or stands in specific word combinations that are revealing for the word's meaning. As regards the verb, in Am. 3:15 its par. word is *'āḇ^e^ḏû,* "they perish," and in Ps. 73:19 *tammû,* "they come to an end/are destroyed." In Dnl. 2:44 the par. word is *taddiq,* "break in pieces." As regards Heb. *sôp̱,* two antonyms are noteworthy: *rō'š,* "beginning," in Eccl. 3:11; and *pānîm* (lit. "face"), "advance guard," in Joel 2:20, where *sôp̱* has the specialized military meaning "rear guard." Aram. *sôp̱* is characterized by a certain formulaic quality.[8]

II. General Usage.

1. *Hebrew and Aramaic swp.* In its basic stem (qal/peal), the verb expresses the cessation of the existence of something (e.g., houses, Am. 3:15; people, Ps. 73:19; Isa. 66:17; memory, Est. 9:28), or that something reaches its intended end (Dnl. 4:30[33]); in the causative stem (hiphil/haphel), it expresses the action of bringing something to an end in some fashion, resulting in meanings such as "snatch away" (Jer. 8:13; Zeph. 1:2f.) or "destroy" (Dnl. 2:44).

2. *sôp̱/sôp̱ā', "End."* Accordingly, *sôp̱* appears in widely varying contexts in reference to the end point of something. The reference can be geographically local (2 Ch. 20:16) or even geographically global (Dnl. 4:8,19[11,22], formulaic: *l^e^sôp̱ [kol-]'ar'ā'* [cf. v. 17(20), otherwise Zeph. 1:2f.]).[9] Or the word can refer temporally or existentially to the end of human life, i.e., it can function as an expression for death (Eccl. 7:2; cf. Ps. 73:19; Isa. 66:17), or in the intellectual-literary sense to the conclusion of some project (Eccl. 12:13; Dnl. 7:28). Together with the antonym "beginning," it encompasses the widest possible extension (Eccl. 3:11, here in reference to God's work in creation). The military-technical use in Joel 2:20 is highly specialized.

III. Theological Aspects. Although the element of conclusion expressed in both the verb and the noun *sôp̱* suggests that they could have been employed in prophetic oracles of judgment, only the verb was so used (cf. Isa. 66:17; Jer. 8:13; Am. 3:15; Zeph. 1:2f.), while only Aram. *sôp̱ā'* preserved some of this eschatological formulaic quality within an apocalyptic framework (Dnl. 6:27[26]; cf. 7:26; also 2:44), a formulaic quality that in earlier prophecy characterized nouns such as *qēṣ,* "end," and → אחרית *'aḥ^a^rîṯ ('ach^a^rîth)* in several passages, and which still attaches to these words in the book of Daniel (cf., e.g., 8:17,23; 11:27,35,40; 12:4,13).[10] Otherwise, the "end" represented by death bestows the insights of wisdom (Eccl. 7:2) as well as liberating consolation in the temptations of theodicy (Ps. 73:19, cf. v. 17).

---

8. See II and III below.

9. In this connection cf. also W. C. van Unnik, "Der Ausdruck 'ΕΩΣ 'ΕΣΧΑΤΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ (Apostelgeschichte I:8) und sein alttestamentlicher Hintergrund," *Studia biblica et semitica. FS T. C. Vriezen* (Wageningen, 1966), 335-49.

10. Cf. M. Wagner, "קֵץ *qēṣ* end," *TLOT,* III, 1153-56; otherwise also W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 203f. Also E. Jenni, "אחר *'ḥr* after," *TLOT,* I, 83-88.

IV. Qumran. This group of words occurs only rarely in the Qumran writings: the verb not at all, and the noun *sôp,* "end," only 3 times (1QH 18:30; 4QpPs37 1:6; 2:7).[11] Every passage involves an eschatological context, with the use of these words here most closely approximating that in the book of Daniel. 11QPs^a^Sir 21:12 contains a citation from Sir. 51:13f. (*sûpâ,* "end of life"). In Mur 45:3 *sûp* refers to the depletion of a store of grain. The noun *sôp* is used to indicate the end point of a given period of time (referring to a lease) (Mur 24 B14, C12, E9). It is used adverbially in the sense of "definitively" in a purchase contract (Mur 22:1-9, 5).

V. LXX. The LXX makes use of a series of Greek words. The verb is rendered by 7 different verbs (Isa. 77:17: [*kat*]*analískein;* Zeph. 1:2-3: *ekleípein;* Dnl. 4:30[33]: [*syn*]*teleín;* Dnl. 2:44: *aphanízein* or [Theodotion] *likmán*). The noun *sôp* has 5 equivalents, among which special mention should be made of *péras* (Dnl. [Theodotion] 4:8,19[11,22]; 7:28) and especially *télos* (Prov. 3:11; 7:3/2; 12:3; Dnl. 6:26/27[26]; 7:26).[12] Apart from a few preferred eschatological terms, no clear pattern of usage is evident here.

Sæbø

11. Cf. H. Stegemann, "Der Pešer Psalm 37 aus Höhle 4 von Qumran (4QpPs37)," *RevQ* 4 (1963) 258 n. 127.

12. Cf. G. Delling, "τέλος," *TDNT,* VIII, 49-57, esp. 51-54. Cf. also G. Kittel, "ἔσχατος," *TDNT,* II, 697-98.

סוף *sûp;* יַם סוּף *yam sûp*

Contents: I. 1. Derivation, Meaning; 2. LXX. II. The So-Called Sea of Reeds in the OT: 1. The Gulf of Aqaba; 2. The Sea of the Exodus; 3. The Crossing during the Exodus from Egypt; 4. History of Transmission.

sûp. G. W. Ahlström, "Judges 5:20f. and History," *JNES* 36 (1977) 287f.; B. F. Batto, "The Reed Sea: Requiescat in Pace," *JBL* 102 (1983) 27-35; G. J. Botterweck, "Israels Errettung am Meer," *BiLe* 8 (1967) 8-33; H. Cazelles, "Les localisations de l'Exode et la critique littéraire," *RB* 62 (1955) 321-54; B. S. Childs, "A Traditio-Historical Study of the Reed Sea Motif," *VT* 20 (1970) 406-18; G. W. Coats, "The Traditio-Historical Character of the Reed Sea Motif," *VT* 17 (1967) 253-65; idem, "The Song of the Sea," *CBQ* 31 (1967) 1-17; idem, "History and Theology in the Sea Tradition," *ST* 29 (1975) 53-62; M. Copisarow, "The Ancient Egyptian, Greek and Hebrew Concept of the Red Sea," *VT* 12 (1962) 1-13; F. M. Cross, "The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," *JTC* 5 (1968) 1-25; idem, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge,

I. 1. *Derivation, Meaning.* As a designation for a water plant, the term *sûp* is generally regarded as a loanword from Egyp. *ṯwf,* "papyrus."[1] This *ṯwf,* however, is first attested only in Late Egyptian.[2] Attempts have also been made to derive *sûp* from the Semitic languages themselves, consistently postulating a biconsonantal etymon:

a. M. Copisarow assumed the existence of **sp* (not attested) with the meaning "end," which was transformed morphologically and semantically during the course of time into → סוֹף *sôp,* "end, boundary." In addition, a noun *sûp* allegedly also existed, originally with the meaning "end, boundary," as a designation for the banks of the Nile, in whose region the Israelites lived during their sojourn in Egypt. During this period, *sûp* then allegedly also acquired the meaning "marsh, marsh plants." Copisarow does not explain how this transition came about.

Mass., 1973); G. I. Davies, *The Way of the Wilderness: A Geographical Study of the Wilderness Itineraries in the OT. SOTSMS* 5 (1979); P. Dhorme, "Le désert de la mer (Is. XXI)," *RB* 31 (1922) 403-6; H. Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen. ATD Erg.* 4/1 (1984), 84-97; O. Eissfeldt, *Baal Zaphon, Zeus Kasios und der Durchzug der Israeliten durchs Meer. Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums* I (Halle, 1932); F. E. Eakin, "The Red Sea and Baalism," *JBL* 86 (1967) 378-84; G. Fohrer, *Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus. BZAW* 91 (1964); M. Haran, "The Exodus Route in the Pentateuchal Sources," *Tarbiz* 40 (1970/71) 113-43; M. Har-El, *The Sinai Journeys: The Route of the Exodus* (San Diego, 1983); L. S. Hay, "What Really Happened at the Sea of Reeds?" *JBL* 83 (1964) 397-403; O. Kaiser, *Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit und Israel. BZAW* 78 ([2]1962); A. Lauha, "Das Schilfmeermotiv im AT," *Congress Volume, Bonn 1962. SVT* 9 (1963), 32-46; M. C. Lind, *Yahweh Is a Warrior: Theology of Warfare in Ancient Israel* (Scottdale, Penn., 1980); D. J. McCarthy, "Plagues and Sea of Reeds: Exodus 5–14," *JBL* 85 (1966) 137-58; P. D. Miller Jr., *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel. HSM* 5 (1973); J. A. Montgomery, "Hebraica. (2) *yam sup* ('the Red Sea') Ultimum Mare?" *JAOS* 58 (1938) 131f.; A. Nibbi, "The Lake of Reeds of the Pyramid Texts and the Yam Sûph," *GM* 29 (1978) 95-100; E. W. Nicholson, *Exodus and Sinai in History and Tradition* (Oxford, 1973); S. I. L. Norin, *Er spaltete das Meer. CB* 9 (1977); M. Noth, "Der Schauplatz des Meereswunders," *FS O. Eissfeldt* (Halle, 1947), 181-90 = Noth, *Aufsätze zur biblischen Landes- und Altertumskunde* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1971), I, 102-10; J. Pedersen, *ILC,* III-IV, 728-37; K. von Rabenau, "Die beiden Erzählungen vom Schilfmeerwunder in Exod. 13,17–14,31," *ThV* 1 (1966) 7-29; P. Reymond, *L'eau, sa vie et sa signification dans l'AT. SVT* 6 (1958), esp. 165f.; J. Scharbert, "Das 'Schilfmeerwunder' in den Texten des AT," *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux. FS H. Cazelles. AOAT* 212 (1981), 395-417; R. Schmid, "Meerwunder- und Landnahme-Tradition," *TZ* 21 (1965) 260-68; J. M. Schmidt, "Erwägungen zum Verhältnis von Auszugs- und Sinaitradition," *ZAW* 82 (1970) 1-31; H. C. Schmitt, "'Priesterliches' und 'prophetisches' Geschichtsverständnis in der Meerwundererzählung Ex 13,17–14,31," *Textgemäss: Aufsätze und Beiträge zur Hermeneutik des AT. FS E. Würthwein* (Göttingen, 1979), 139-55; N. H. Snaith, "יַם סוּף: The Sea of Reeds: The Red Sea," *VT* 15 (1965) 395-98; J. R. Towers, "The Red Sea," *JNES* 18 (1959) 150-53; R. de Vaux, *The Early History of Israel* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1978), esp. 376ff.; W. A. Ward, "The Semitic Biconsonantal Root *sp* and the Common Origin of Egyptian *čwf* and Hebrew *sûp:* 'Marsh (Plant),'" *VT* 24 (1974) 339-49; P. Weimar and E. Zenger, *Exodus: Geschichten und Geschichte der Befreiung Israels. SBS* 75 (1975); G. R. H. Wright, "The Passage of the Sea (Ex 13–14)," *GM* 33 (1979) 55-68.

1. Cf. W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus. BK* II (1974), 70.
2. *WbÄS,* V, 359.

b. W. A. Ward picks up Copisarow's suggestions and similarly postulates a **sp,* "bowl, basin"; cf. Heb. *sap̱,* Ugar. *sp,* Phoen. *sp,* Akk. *s/šappu,* and Egyp. *śp.t.* According to Ward, the association between a bowl filled with liquid and a watery, swampy region seems evident. The root *sp* allegedly meant originally "attain, arrive," whence the derivatives *sôp̱,* "end, boundary," *sp,* "bowl," "basin," and *sûp̱,* "marsh plant." Ward, however, supports this explanation not with etymological considerations but rather with the geographical argument that at the "end" of a journey to the north in Egypt, one arrived at the Nile Delta, which thus constituted the boundary of the country.

c. The derivation from *sp,* "bowl, basin," however, presents difficulties. On the one hand, the etymological double *p* (cf. Akk. *s/šappu;* Arab. *suffat*) is present not in *sûp̱* but rather in Heb. *sippîm,* "bowls."[3] Hence the etymological **sp(p)* is fixed in Hebrew. On the other hand, this hypothesis leaves unexplained the origin of the *w* in its function as a full consonant in *sûp̱.*

d. Similarly, the emended pointing to *yam sôp̱,* "border sea," often postulated with reference to the Samaritan Pentateuch, cannot be text-critically secured,[4] and a textual emendation on the basis of geographical considerations is also impermissible (see above). Neither does the reference to 1 K. 9:26, where the LXX rendering is *éschata thálassa,* "farthest sea," take the discussion any further, since this *yam sûp̱* cannot be reconciled with that associated with the exodus of Israel from Egypt.

Lamberty-Zielinski

The meaning "water plant" occurs in the OT in Ex. 2:3,5 (Moses in the rushes); Isa. 19:6 (reeds [*qāneh*] and rushes in the Nile dry up), and Jon. 2:6(Eng. v. 5) (reed-grass wraps itself around the prophet's head). Thus 3 of the 4 occurrences are associated with Egypt.[5]

2. *LXX.* The LXX translates Ex. 2:3,5 and Isa. 19:6 with *hélos,* "marshy area," and circumscribes Jon. 2:6(5). The expression *yam sûp̱* is rendered with *hē erythrá thálassa.*[6]

II. The So-Called Sea of Reeds in the OT.

1. *The Gulf of Aqaba.* The expression *yam sûp̱* is ambiguous. It refers not only to the sea of the exodus miracle ("Reed Sea"), frequently also called simply *yam,* "sea," but also to an eastern sea, probably the Gulf of Aqaba. According to 1 K. 9:26, Solomon built a fleet in Ezion-geber, "which is near *'ēlôṯ* (LXX *Ailath*) on the shore of the *yam sûp̱,* in the land of Edom." The parallel text 2 Ch. 8:17 has only "on the shore in the land of Edom." Jer. 49:21 is also clearly associated with Edom, but otherwise the location presents enormous problems. Nu. 33:10f. is probably speaking of the Gulf of Aqaba; the passage through the sea is already mentioned in v. 8, though not by name.

---

3. *AHw,* II, 1027; *HAL,* II, 762.
4. See *BHK, BHS;* cf. Snaith.
5. Cf. B. Couroyer, "Quelques Égyptianismes dans l'Exode," *RB* 63 (1956) 14, 73.
6. Concerning 1 K. 9:26, see I.1 above.

In the determination of the boundaries of the land in Ex. 23:31, *yam sûp̱* might be referring to the Gulf of Aqaba:[7] "from the *yam sûp̱* to the sea of the Philistines, and from the wilderness to the river" (cf. 1 K. 9:26). Similar geographical terminology also occurs in the description of the route in Ex. 13:17f.: "the way into the land of the Philistines . . . the way through the wilderness toward (?) the *yam sûp̱*," a passage that because of its difficult syntax *(dereḵ hammiḏbār yam-sûp̱)* is probably to be taken as a secondary addendum, and thus geographically useless (cf. the syntactically correct formulations in Nu. 14:25; 21:4; without explicit reference to the wilderness in Dt. 1:40; 2:1). Perhaps Ex. 10:19 also belongs in this context. According to v. 13, Yahweh sent the east wind *(rûaḥ qāḏîm)* from the desert, which brought locusts; then a west wind drove the locusts into the *yam sûp̱* (Gulf of Aqaba?).[8]

The relation between the sea and the desert provides some clues to the location of the "Reed Sea." The desert is the region around Kardesh-barnea. In the pertinent texts, the sea lies east of or adjacent to the desert. One cannot derive any persuasive geographical statement from the constellation of the individual exodus motifs, since these motifs can be combined in various ways (cf. Ps. 78:51-53). The word *ṣᵉʿāqâ* in Jer. 49:21, however, contains an allusion to the events during the departure from Egypt (cf. Ex. 14:11; Josh. 24:7).

2. *The Sea of the Exodus from Egypt.* There is another *yam sûp̱,* however, if the wildernesses of Zin, Shur, Paran, and Etham are referring to the region of Kadesh-barnea, and if the wilderness wandering took place in a logical fashion after the deliverance at the sea. Several texts locate the *yam sûp̱* west of the wilderness and at the eastern boundary of Egypt. The Israelites themselves traverse this sea without getting wet, while the pursuing Egyptians drown in the waters flooding back on them (Ex. 15:4,22; Dt. 11:4; Josh. 2:10; 4:23; 24:6; Neh. 9:9; Ps. 106:7,9,22; 136:13ff.). Almost every body of water between the Mediterranean Sea and the Gulf of Suez has been suggested as the location of this sea.[9] This results from an identification of the Egyp. *pꜣ ṯwf* with the Heb. *yam sûp̱* as the designation of a marshy area in the northeastern part of the Nile Delta, an area for whose location various suggestions have advanced.[10] If one is looking for a "sea" around which papyrus *(sûp̱)* grows, then only a shallow lake or a marsh can be considered, suggesting the region in the eastern Nile Delta. This is not necessarily contradicted by the fact that in the traditions involving this passage, the sea is portrayed as deep, and the quantities of water as massive and powerful, since one must reckon with different degrees of mythologizing attaching to the various sources.

The question is just how the sea associated with the exodus acquired the name *yam sûp̱*. The connection with Egypt, where, as is well known, papyrus grows (Ex. 2:3,5; Isa. 19:6), might have caused a secondary process of naming and some confusion with

---

7. Montgomery, 132.
8. Cf. de Vaux, 377.
9. See Cazelles; Donner, 92ff.
10. Cf. Bietak, "Schilfmeer," *LexÄg,* V, 629-34.

the original *yam sôp̱,* the "border sea." In some texts (such as Ex. 15:4; Josh. 24:6; Ps. 106:7), *yam sûp̱* is used as a more specific explication of *yām* with reference to the sea of the exodus (as a later addendum?).[11] B. F. Batto argues similarly with reference to N. H. Snaith, who believes that *yam sûp̱* refers to the primal sea; it is the *yam sôp̱,* the sea at the end (of the land), whose boundaries are known to no one.[12] Batto adduces support from Jon. 2:6(5), where *sûp̱* has nothing to do with vegetation but rather is to be translated by "annihilation."[13]

3. *The Crossing during the Exodus from Egypt.* In tradition this passage through the sea became the salvific act surpassing all others. In contrast to preexilic texts, P especially describes the parting of the sea in formulaic, mythological categories.[14] As in Canaanite mythology, the sea and river function as parallel expressions for the powers of chaos subdued by Yahweh (Ps. 66:5f.; 74:13ff.; 89:26[25]; 114:3ff.; Isa. 11:15; 50:2; Nah. 1:4; Zec. 10:11). In general, although a clear association with the exodus miracle is present, the sea is not mentioned by name (though Isa. 11:15 speaks of the "gulf [RSV 'tongue'] of the sea of Egypt"). It is clear that this event has acquired the form of myth, and that it involves the creation of Israel and its genesis as a people. This imagery is also used in reference to reestablishment in the future. Isaiah does not attest *yam sûp̱* (only *sûp̱* in 19:6, though the association with Egypt is clear). Isa. 10:26 relates that "he will lift his rod over the sea as he did in Egypt" (cf. also 43:2 and 43:16f., "he makes a way in the sea, a path in the mighty waters"). The same theme recurs in 51:9ff., which proclaims that the exiles will return from Babylon in the same way. It should be noted that the prose account in Ex. 14:2ff. does not mention the sea by name either. Here the sea is situated west of the wilderness (v. 3), though the people are in the wilderness. Nah. 3:8 mentions the sea as the "wall of Egypt."

The word field exhibits a more or less mythological character in the portrayals of the passage through the sea as part of salvation history. The event transcends geography and history.[15] Moses' role is hardly mentioned. Yahweh is the subject of the verbs describing the subjection of the sea (or river). The verbs used in this context include *bāqa',* "divide, part" (Ex. 14:16,21; Neh. 9:11; Ps. 74:15; 78:13); → גער *gā'ar,* "rebuke" (Isa. 50:2; Nah. 1:4; Ps. 106:9); *nkh* hiphil (Zec. 10:11); *ḥrm* hiphil (Isa. 11:15, one should probably read *ḥrb*); → יבשׁ *ybš* hiphil, "dry up" (Josh. 2:10; 4:23; Zec. 10:11); *hāp̱ak̠ lᵉyabbāšâ* (Ps. 66:6); *ṣwp* hiphil, "make overflow, flood" (Dt. 11:4); *māšal,* "rule" (Ps. 89:10[9]); *rāga',* "disturb, stir up" (Job 26:12); *šbḥ* piel, "still, bring to rest" (Ps. 65:8[7]). We also read that he cast *(yārâ)* chariot and rider into the sea (Ex. 15:4), or that he drove *(n'r)* Pharaoh and his host into the sea (Ex. 14:27; Ps. 136:15),

---

11. Cf. Norin, 94, 105.
12. Cf., however, I.1 above.
13. Batto, 31ff. Cf. also Ahlström, 287.
14. Cf. E. Zenger, "Tradition und Interpretation in Exodus XV 1-21," *Congress Volume, Vienna 1980. SVT* 32 (1981), 452-83; N. Lohfink, "The Priestly Narrative and History," *Theology of the Pentateuch* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1994), 136-72.
15. Cf. Hay; Coats, "History and Theology."

and that the sea covered the enemies (Ex. 15:10; Dt. 11:4; Josh. 24:7; Ps. 78:53; 106:11).[16]

The purpose of this divine action — and its description reflects this — is always to create a path or dry ground in the sea so that Israel can pass through (*'āḇar).* Yahweh allows the people to pass through (hiphil: Ps. 78:13; 136:14; Zec. 10:11); the people pass through (qal: Ex. 15:16; Ps. 66:6). He makes a way through the sea (Ps. 77:20[19]; Isa. 43:16; 51:10f.), or creates dry ground (Ps. 106:9; Neh. 9:11; Isa. 50:2; further with *yabbāšâ:* Ex. 14:16,22,29; 15:19; Josh. 4:22; Ps. 66:6; 95:5). To this end, he uses the wind (storm): *rûaḥ, sûpâ, s^e'ārâ, sa'ar,* terms often used in theophany portrayals to emphasize Yahweh's power. Just as the wind causes the waters of the flood to subside (Gen. 8:1), so also does the east wind divide the sea (Ex. 14:21ff.; 15:8). The east wind is a dry desert wind (Gen. 41:6,23; Ex. 10:13), called the "wind of Yahweh" (Hos. 13:15). In the poetic version of the exodus miracle, Yahweh causes his wind to blow in order to drown the Egyptians (Ex. 15:10; cf. Dt. 11:4; Josh. 24:7; Ps. 78:53; 106:11).

In the J portion of Ex. 14, the dramatic events at the *yam sûp* are characterized by the force of the elements, with the storm playing a significant role. According to this version, this does not involve a sea with papyrus growth. The few bits of information about *yam sûp* as an allusion to the Gulf of Aqaba characterize it as a stormy sea. Thus the ships of Jehoshaphat were destroyed in the harbor (1 K. 22:49[48] par. 2 Ch. 20:36f.). Perhaps the place-names *sûp* and *sûpâ* (Dt. 1:1; Nu. 21:14) point in the same direction. Although the common denominator for *yam sûp* = Aqaba and the sea of the exodus is the strong wind, this fits other areas as well. For example, O. Eissfeldt refers to Lake Sirbonis, in which during antiquity entire armies were allegedly destroyed by wind and shifting sands.[17] The passage on dry ground, however, turns this event into an act of creation during which the dry land becomes visible just as during the creation of the world (Gen. 1:9). The sea of the exodus is hardly a geographical sea but rather mythological.[18]

4. *History of Transmission.* The evidence in the history of transmission is unclear. The complex surrounding the Reed Sea stands between the portrayal of the plagues in Egypt and the wilderness wanderings. General consensus holds that all three pentateuchal sources are represented, though opinions differ regarding details. In general, J allegedly includes: Ex. 12:37f.; 13:20-22; 14:5b-6,10b,13f.,20,21a,24,25b, 27ab,30,31; E includes 13:17-19; 14:5a,7,11f.,19a,25a; and P includes 14:1-4,8-10a, 15-18, 21ab, 22f.,26,27a,28f.[19] The J version describes how the east wind dries out the sea; Israel stands by and watches while the Egyptians become confused and drown in the masses of water. J does not even mention the passage through the sea! According to the other cohesive version by P, Moses waves his rod so that the water divides and stands up on both sides like a wall. After the passage, Moses extends his rod and the

16. → ים *yām* (VI, 87-98).
17. Pp. 61ff.
18. Reymond, 172ff.
19. Donner, 93.

waters return.[20] According to M. Noth, the events at the sea constitute the core of the exodus tradition, but the complex surrounding the Reed Sea belongs neither to the Passover nor to the plagues (contra Pedersen). The miracle at the Reed Sea comes completely unexpectedly.[21] According to Coats, however, the episode at the sea is not part of the exodus tradition, since the formula "Yahweh led us out of Egypt" is not associated with it; it belongs rather to the wilderness wanderings. The enormous inconsistencies in the text have also prompted B. S. Childs to understand the episode at the sea in JE as part of the wilderness wanderings, while in P it constitutes part of the exodus tradition.[22] According to this understanding, J contains nothing about the passage through the sea, and the episode at the sea would have been transferred gradually during the process of transmission from the wilderness wanderings to the exodus, where it ultimately acquired a central position in the departure account. The miracle at the sea became the high point of the liberation from Egypt. Childs finds proof for this in Ps. 106:13ff. and Neh. 9:9ff.; in the latter text the sea tradition was finally identified completely with the exodus.

On the one hand, geographically, Lake Sirbonis would fit the P tradition (cf. Ex. 14:2); this generates difficulties, however, since P calls the exodus waters *yām* instead of *yam sûp*. On the other hand, according to P the *yam sûp* is reached only after (!) the wilderness wanderings (cf. Nu. 33:10). Despite precise analysis of the texts, it is impossible to determine the location of the sea of the exodus. The process of transmission leads to a mythologizing of the event, so that it is characterized as an act that Yahweh alone is able to carry out.

Ottosson

20. Norin, 21ff.
21. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 104.
22. Pp. 407ff.

סוּפָה *sûpâ*

Contents: I. 1. Occurrences; 2. Etymology; 3. Synonyms. II. Meaning and Usage: 1. As a Natural Phenomenon; 2. As a Metaphor. III. LXX.

sûpâ. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 342; H. Lugt, "Wirbelstürme im AT," *BZ* 19 (1975) 195-204.

I.1. *Occurrences.* The noun *sûpâ* occurs 15 times in the OT with the meaning "storm wind," once in Sirach (Sir. 43:17), and once in the Qumran writings (CD 19:25). The place-name *sûpâ* in Nu. 21:14, referring to a locale in the land of Moab, is not considered here.[1]

The passages discussed more specifically below show that *sûpâ* belongs to poetic language, since all these passages stand in the prophetic and wisdom writings of the OT. This unique usage is accompanied by the fact that *sûpâ* is hitherto unattested in related Semitic languages. G. Dalman does not include the word *sûpâ* in his index of Hebrew words, since it obviously no longer represents a conventional designation for any wind, though he does describe in detail the occurrences and effects of various types of winds.[2] According to H. Lugt, *sûpâ* is to be rendered in most passages by the meteorological term "whirlwind," a phenomenon he explains with the appropriate specialized knowledge.[3]

2. *Etymology.* The meaning listed by Gesenius, "turbo, quippe qui omnia abripiat," derived from the verbal root *sûp* I, "rapere, auferre," is confirmed by the word's use, finding an appropriate translation in the rendering "driving storm wind, gale."[4] *HAL* associates it with → סוף *swp*, "come to an end."[5]

3. *Synonyms.* Synonymous terms include *sa'ar/se'ārâ/śe'ārâ* (Isa. 29:6; Nah. 1:3; Ps. 83:16[Eng. v. 15]; Sir. 43:17); also *rûaḥ qāḏîm*, "east wind" (Job 27:21), *mezārîm* (Job 37:9), and *'al'ōl*, "north wind" (Sir. 43:17), as well as *šô'â*, "thunderstorm" (Prov. 1:27). The term *sûpâ* clearly refers to a more violent movement of air than usually expressed by *rûaḥ*, as evident in the proverb in Hos. 8:7: "Indeed, they sow the wind and mow the whirlwind."[6] This is why 1 K. 19:11 also uses *rûaḥ geḏôlâ* to express the vehemence of the storm accompanying Yahweh's coming.

An additional difference between *sûpâ* and *rûaḥ* is that the latter brings needed rain, the former only disaster and destruction.[7]

II. Meaning and Usage.

1. *As a Natural Phenomenon.* a. *In Nature Wisdom.* Two poems in the book of Job provide examples of the nature wisdom of that age. In Job 38:1–39:30 Yahweh demonstrates his unfathomable wisdom through a series of questions addressing the realms of animate and inanimate nature. Elihu has already attempted something similar earlier (32:2), referring especially to meteorological phenomena such as rain, wind, and storm (36:27–37:12). These natural phenomena are associated directly with Yahweh's per-

1. Cf. J. Simons, *GTTOT,* §441 n. 229.
2. *AuS,* I.
3. P. 202.
4. *GesTh,* 943; *GesB,* 539; see II below.
5. *HAL,* II, 747.
6. Translation according to H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 132.
7. → מטר *māṭār* (VIII, 250-65).

son: "From its chamber comes the storm wind, and cold from the north wind; from the breath of God ice is given" (37:9f.).[8] The same notions recur in Ps. 104:4, as well as in Sir. 43:17: "The whirlwind of the north, storm and tempest, like sparks he shakes his snow."[9]

b. *Theological Contexts.* Whereas the governing notion in the previously discussed passages is that Yahweh is the initiator of these natural phenomena, Nah. 1:3 describes these as phenomena accompanying his coming. "When [v. 3b] a storm or whirlwind suddenly breaks loose, terrible in the might of its strength, then Yahweh is on the way (cf. Ps. 83:16[15]; Isa. 29:6), and the gusting, quickly shifting clouds . . . are caused by his strides."[10]

In this context the reference is not to a theophany in the strict sense, which elsewhere in the OT is associated with thunder, lightning, and earthquakes, but not with a storm wind. Hence J. Jeremias does not list *sûpâ* in his index of Hebrew words.[11] 1 K. 19:11f. cannot be considered here, since its point is precisely that Yahweh cannot be found in the *rûaḥ gᵉḏôlâ.* The association of Yahweh with meteorological natural phenomena, however, does make clear that the OT understanding of God did appropriate elements of non-Israelite weather deities.[12]

2. *As a Metaphor.* Apart from these 3 occurrences, *sûpâ* thus occurs only as a metaphor, though in widely varying contexts.

a. *Military Usage.* Isa. 5:28 describes the advancing military might of the Assyrians with the words: "Their horses' hoofs seem like hard stones, and their chariot wheels like the storm wind." Jer. 4:13 describes the mysterious "enemy from the north" with similar words. In both instances *sûpâ* functions as a synonym for war chariots *(merkāḇâ)* or their wheels *(galgal).* In Isa. 66:15 it is Yahweh's own war chariots that resemble the storm wind or whirlwind. Media and Elam, as the powers that Babylon will sweep away, are also compared with the storm wind (Isa. 21:1). Am. 1:14 uses the image of the devouring fire and the "day of the whirlwind" in describing the judgment Yahweh will visit on Ammon.

b. *Theological Usage.* The storm wind emanating from Yahweh then also functions as a symbol for his salvific intervention on behalf of his people in their political or eschatological afflictions. In Isa. 29:6 Yahweh's *sûpâ* and *sᵉʿārâ* deliver Jerusalem, called "Ariel" in this context (similarly also Isa. 66:15); Ps. 83:16(15) describes the destruction of Israel's neighbors Edom, Ammon, and Assyria with reference to Yahweh's aid during the period of the judges (v. 10[9]; similarly Isa. 17:13). Enemies are often compared with chaff (*qaš,* Ps. 83:14[13]; → מֹץ *mōṣ,* Job 21:18; Isa. 17:13), straw

---

8. Concerning the translation of *mᵉzārîm,* cf. *HAL,* II, 567; and G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 481.

9. Translation according to G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach. JSHRZ* 3/5 (Gütersloh, 1981), 613.

10. W. Rudolph, *Nahum. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 155.

11. *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung. WMANT* 10 (1965).

12. Cf. L. Köhler, *OT Theology* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1957), 26f.

(*teḇen,* Job 21:18), or with the dried thistles that roll up into wheellike configurations (Lat. *Gundelia tournefortii,* Heb. *galgal,* Ps. 83:14[13]; Isa. 17:13).[13]

c. *Wisdom.* Just as in the military-political sphere, so also in the life of the individual does the storm wind *(sûpâ)* function as a synonym for disaster and ruin. Whereas in Job 27:20 and Prov. 10:25 *sûpâ* symbolizes the destruction of the wicked[14] brought about by Yahweh, in Hos. 8:7 it is the person himself who through his own misdeed causes enormous misfortune to befall both himself and others. This is probably also the sense of CD 19:25; the person falling away from the "congregation of the new covenant in the land of Damascus" "goes according to the wind *(rûaḥ)* and bears storm winds *(sûpôṯ)* and preaches lies to people."[15] One might also note that this text involves the same juxtaposition of *rûaḥ* and *sûpâ* as in Hos. 8:7.

In contrast, Prov. 1:27 expressly designates the image of the storm wind as a comparison: "when panic strikes you like a storm, and your calamity comes like a storm wind, when distress and anguish come upon you."[16] Job 21:18 again expands the image, comparing the wicked — like Israel's enemies earlier (Ps. 83:14f.[13f.]; Isa. 17:13) — with chaff that is blown away by the calamity symbolized by the storm wind (*gnb* has the sense of "carry off, abduct" here; concerning this imagery, cf. also Ps. 1:4).

III. LXX. The LXX uses seven different terms for *sûpâ,* especially *kataigís* (8 times), *orgḗ* (Ps. 83:16[15] [LXX 82:16]),[17] and *syntéleia* (twice).

Beyse

---

13. Cf. *AuS,* I, 53; H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1989), 163; M. Zohary, *Plants of the Bible* (Eng. trans., Cambridge, 1982), 163.

14. → רשׁע *rāšāʿ.*

15. Cf. E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, ²1971), 102f.

16. Cf. B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos. HAT* XVI (²1963), 22.

17. Cf. J. Fichtner and O. Grether, "ὀργή," *TDNT,* V, 399, 410f.

סוּר *sûr;* סָרָה *sārâ*

Contents: I. Etymology and Occurrences. II. Semantic Field and Concrete Meaning. III. Figurative Usage: 1. Deviation from the Right Path; 2. Deviation from the Commandments; 3. Deviation from Yahweh; 4. Deviation from the Way of the Father; 5. Yahweh Turns Aside from Individuals; 6. Turning Aside from Evil. IV. *sārâ.* V. Qumran.

---

sûr. S. E. Balentine, "A Description of the Semantic Field of Hebrew Words for 'Hide,'" *VT* 30 (1980) 137-53; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 337-56,

I. Etymology and Occurrences. The term *sûr* is not widely distributed in the Semitic languages. It is found in Akk. *sâru,* "to circle, dance," in the Ugar. PN *b'lsr,* in Phoenician and Punic as a verb taking an accusative object with the meaning "remove," and in OSA *śwr,* "separate off."[1]

The qal is attested 158 times in the OT, the hiphil 133 times. A polel form is found in Lam. 3:11, and a hophal form in Lev. 4:31,35; 1 S. 21:7(Eng. v. 6); Isa. 17:1; Dnl. 2:11. The verb is distributed fairly evenly, with a concentration in Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and Isaiah.

In Jer. 2:21, where God says that although he planted Israel as a choice vine, it turned into *sûrê heggepen, BHS* follows B. Duhm in reading *l^esôrîyâ gepen,* and associates it with Jewish Aramaic *s^erî,* "stink" (Targ. Ex. 7:18,21; Prov. 11:22).[2] Isa. 5:2 and 4 refer to *b^e'uŝîm,* i.e., bad, sour grapes, "unripe, wild grapes." One then also expects in v. 21b a substantive parallel with *śōrēq* in v. 21a. Perhaps this involves an otherwise unknown *sûr* (from *sûr,* "deviate from"), i.e., "deviating," contaminated grapes, in contrast with *zera' 'emet* (v. 21a: "a genuine growth"). This fits *gepen nokrîyâ* (v. 21b: wild, overgrown vine). In Isa. 8:11 one should follow 1QIsa^a and point *way^esîrēnî* (hiphil of *sûr*) instead of MT *w^eyiss^erēnî* (from *ysr*).[3]

Individual passages confuse the letters *s* and *ś*. For example, on the one hand, in 1 S. 22:14 one should follow the LXX and Targs. in reading *śar,* "leader, commander," instead of *sār,* "deviating." In contrast, Hos. 9:12 should read *b^esûrî mēhem* instead of *b^eśûrî mēhem.*[4] On the other hand, there is no need to emend the expression *sārê sôr^erîm* (Jer. 6:28) to *śarê sôr^erîm,* as does *BHS.*[5] M. Dahood has suggested interpreting the expression *histîr pānîm,* "hide one's face," as a hiphil of *sûr* with an infixed *t,* the reference then being to a turning away of one's countenance. The LXX concurs with this, since except for Job 13:24 and 34:29 it translates with *apostréphein.*[6] If this is a sound suggestion, then the occurrences of *sûr* would increase by about 30 passages. Although J. A. Thompson appropriates this interpretation for Isa. 8:17, both S. B. Wheeler and A. S. van der Woude reject it.[7]

The LXX has no specific equivalent for *sûr,* using instead more than 40 different

---

esp. 343; E. Jenni, "Dtn 19,16: *sarā* 'Falschheit,'" *De la Tôrah au Messie. FS H. Cazelles. AOAT* 212 (1981), 201-11; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch," *VT* 8 (1958) 161-215; S. Schwertner, "סור *sûr* to deviate," *TLOT,* II, 796-97; J. A. Thompson, "A Proposed Translation of Isaiah 8,17," *ExpT* 83 (1971/72) 376.

1. See, respectively, *AHw,* II, 1031f.; *PNU,* 184; *DNSI,* II, 781; Biella, 503f.

2. Cf. *HAL,* II, 749, s.v. *sûr* I; B. Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia. Die poetische und prophetische Bücher des ATs* 3 (Tübingen, 1907).

3. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 355.

4. See III.5 below.

5. See III.3 below.

6. M. Dahood, review of G. Garbini, *Il Semitico di Nord-Ovest* (Naples, 1960), *Or* 32 (1963) 498f.

7. Thompson, 376; Wheeler, "The Infixed -t- in Biblical Hebrew," *JANES* 3/1 (1970/71) 28-31; van der Woude, "פָּנִים *pānîm* face," *TLOT,* II, 1008.

renderings, including especially *apérchesthai, apostréphein, aposchízein, exaírein, epistréphein, ekklínein,* and *aphistánai.*

II. Semantic Field and Concrete Meaning. The verb *sûr* means "turn aside, deviate (from the path)." The cows before the cart with the ark "went straight in the direction of Beth-shemesh along one highway, lowing as they went; they turned neither to the right nor to the left" (1 S. 6:12). The antonym to *sûr* is "go straight ahead" (*yšr* piel), "walk in the way" (2 K. 22:2). The expression "turn aside neither to the right nor to the left" occurs no less than 10 times (Dt. 2:27; 5:32; 17:11,20; 28:14; Josh. 1:7; 23:6; 1 S. 6:12; 2 K. 22:2; 2 Ch. 34:2). For example, Moses sends emissaries to Sihon, the king of Heshbon, with the message, "I wish to pass through your land; I will go only by the road, I will turn aside neither to the right nor to the left" (Dt. 2:27). The verb → נטה *nāṭâ* is used similarly (Nu. 20:17; 22:26; 2 S. 2:19,21), and the two verbs are parallel in Isa. 30:11: "Depart from *(sûr)* the way, turn aside (*nṭh* hiphil) from the path." Other semantically related verbs include → עזב *ʿāzab̠,* "forsake" (Jer. 17:13a-b); → סוג *sûg,* "fall away, turn apostate" (Ps. 14:3; 53:4[3]); *śāṭâ,* "err onto the wrong path, deviate" (Prov. 4:15; 7:25); → מוש *mûš,* "depart from a certain place" (Ex. 13:22); *yāṣāʾ min,* "go out from" (Isa. 52:11); → סבב *sāb̠ab̠,* in its basic meaning "turn away" (e.g., Josh. 7:9; Nu. 34:4; Ezk. 1:9); and → זור *zûr,* "turn away, become estranged" (Job 19:13; Ezk. 14:5). In the Targs., Aram. *zûr* sometimes corresponds to Heb. *sûr* (Gen. 19:2; Nu. 16:26).

Although the point of departure for such turning aside is usually not mentioned, the goal is; for example, Moses says, "I will turn aside and see this great sight" (Ex. 3:3; cf. Jgs. 14:8). "Who will turn aside to ask about your welfare?" (Jer. 15:5). Turning aside from a path is often associated with an invitation to enter someone's house. Lot sits in the city gate of Sodom, sees the angel, and speaks: "My lords, turn aside, I pray you, to your servant's house . . . and they turned aside to him and entered his house" (Gen. 19:2f.). When the "redeemer" comes by, Boaz invites him to "turn aside, friend; sit down here" (Ruth 4:1). Similar expressions occur in Jgs. 4:18; 18:3; 19:11f.,15; 20:8; 1 K. 20:39; 2 K. 4:8,10f.; Prov. 9:4,16; Jer. 15:5. The hiphil can also have this meaning, e.g., "David did not allow the ark to turn aside into the city to him," i.e., he did not allow it to be brought into the city (2 S. 6:10 par. 1 Ch. 13:13). Commensurate with this, Aram. *sayyēr* must often be translated as "visit" in the Talmud; that man sins who visits his possessions on the sabbath (Bab. *Giṭ.* 38b; cf. *B. Meṣ.* 76b: *Ḥul.* 105a).

The goal or change of direction is indicated by *le* or *ʾel,* e.g., "Come now, let us turn aside to this city *(ʾel ʿîr)* of the Jebusites, and spend the night in it" (Jgs. 19:11). Jgs. 20:8 uses *hālak̠ le* as the equivalent of *sûr le:* "We will not any of us go to his tent, and none of us will return to his house."

The place from which one turns away is indicated by *min:* "the pillar of cloud that led them in the way did not depart from them" (*mēʿalêhem,* Neh. 9:19). "The swarms of flies will depart from Pharaoh, from his servants, and from his people" (*mippar'ōh,* etc., Ex. 8:25). The prophet admonishes the people to leave the land of exile: "Depart *(sûr),* go out *(yāṣāʾ)* thence" (Isa. 52:11). There is a promise that God "will no more allow Israel's foot to depart from the land" (2 Ch. 33:8).

The departure from a certain path is not always presupposed. Objects can "depart from" their places when they are removed or destroyed; in such instances, *sûr* then acquires the meaning "vanish." The Deuteronomistic history asserts formulaically that although the kings acted properly and were believers during their reigns, nonetheless the high places did not "disappear" (1 K. 15:14; 22:44; 2 K. 12:4[3]; 14:4; 15:4,35); 2 Ch. 15:17 says unmistakably: *mîyiśrā'ēl,* "from Israel." The LXX reads a hiphil in several passages, translating accordingly as "remove, eliminate." The noise of carousers (Am. 6:7; cf. 5:23), the drinking party (Hos. 4:18; cf. 1 S. 1:14), or the bitterness of death (1 S. 15:32) can vanish or disappear.

The construction *sûr 'al* in 1 K. 22:32 is unique. Both the LXX and the parallel passage 2 Ch. 18:31 read *wayyāsōbbû,* from *sbb,* "surround, encircle." The combination *sbb 'al,* however, is also rare (elsewhere only in Job 16:13). It is possible that the prep. *'al* here has the meaning "down upon."[8] This then presupposes that the Syrians are situated in a strategically favorable position and can attack the enemy in the valley from above. But *'al* can also refer to the concept of burden or superior power.[9] The niphal of *sbb* can also mean "turn around, change direction." When this happens with hostile intentions and with superior forces, the expression is *nāsaḇ 'al* (Josh. 7:9; Gen. 19:4: the men do not encircle Lot's house — something difficult in a city with houses close together — but rather "they turned in against the house"). The expression *sûr 'al* has the same meaning in 1 K. 22:32: The thirty-two captains of the chariots turned toward the king of Israel in order to attack him.

The hiphil *hēsîr* means "eliminate, remove," and is usually used with the prep. *min:* "But my steadfast love *(ḥeseḏ)* will not depart [qal] from him, as I caused it to depart [hiphil] from Saul, whom I removed [hiphil] from you" (2 S. 7:15). "I will take every sickness away from the midst of you" (Ex. 23:25), "the name of Ba'al from her mouth" (Hos. 2:19[17]), "its blood from its mouth" (Zec. 9:7). Such removal similarly includes foreign gods (Gen. 35:2; Josh. 24:14), foreign altars (2 Ch. 14:2[3]), high places and images of the sun (2 Ch. 14:4[5]), abominations (2 Ch. 34:33), heads (from shoulders, 1 S. 17:46; 2 K. 6:32), and garments (Dt. 21:13; Ezk. 26:16). Immaterial things can also be eliminated, however, such as reproach (1 S. 17:26), one's right (Job 27:2; 34:5), commandments (Josh. 11:15), words (Isa. 31:2; the translation "he [God] did not take his words back" yields a different sense, one not intended), a prayer (Ps. 66:20), sin (Isa. 27:9), and the foreskin of the heart (Jer. 4:4). People are driven away: kings from their thrones (1 K. 20:24; 2 Ch. 36:3), the queen mother from her position (1 K. 15:13 par. 2 Ch. 15:16), the proud from their positions (Zeph. 3:11), mediums and wizards out of the land (1 S. 28:3). "Removal," in the sense of "put aside, separate out" (portions of offerings), is intended in 2 Ch. 35:12.

The single occurrence of the polel also has causative meaning: the lion "has driven me off my way and torn me to pieces" (Lam. 3:11).

The hophal is attested in 5 passages: Lev. 4:31,35 (fat is "removed" from sacrificial

---

8. *KBL*², 704, s.v. 6.
9. *KBL*², 704, s.v. 8; in *HAL,* II, 826, the passages s.v. 5, "against," might be adduced.

meat); 1 S. 21:7 (the bread of the Presence is "removed" from the table); Dnl. 12:11 (the daily offering is "taken away"); Isa. 17:1 (Damascus is put aside *mēʿîr,* i.e., it ceases to be a city).

III. Figurative Usage.

1. *Deviation from the Right Path.* "Making a turn" presupposes the notion of a path that is left behind. This is also the case when the reference is to one's life course and behavior. People tell the seers, "leave *(sûrû)* the way, turn aside *(haṭṭû)* from the path" (Isa. 30:11), i.e., from the mode of life prescribed for Israel (cf. Jer. 12:16). When the people make a golden calf, Moses is admonished: "Go down. . . . They have turned aside quickly from the way that I commanded them" (Ex. 32:8; cf. Dt. 9:12,16). Their → דרך *dereḵ* is not the way of those delivered from the house of slavery, those who fear Yahweh and trust in him and Moses (Ex. 14:31). By worshiping the calf and asserting that it is the god who led them out of Egypt, they are following the "Egyptian way" (Ex. 32:4). Jeremiah speaks of the "way of the nations *(gôyim)*" (10:2), which Israel should avoid; in this context the reference is to idolatry.

One should not turn aside from the way and serve foreign gods (Dt. 11:16; 31:29). The law pertaining to the king in Dt. 17 decrees that the king is not to take many wives, "lest his heart turn away" (v. 17). 1 K. 11:2 uses → נטה *nāṭâ* for such turning: "for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods." Following other gods results in a person turning aside from God's word (Dt. 28:14). One should walk in the way which Yahweh has commanded, turning aside neither to the right nor the left (Dt. 5:32f.). This path of obedience is "the way in which their fathers walked"; departure from it is associated with the worship of foreign gods (Jgs. 2:17). Those who do not obey Yahweh's commandments, who turn aside from the way and pursue foreign gods, will be cursed (Dt. 11:28).

One notices that in these passages, such deviation from the way is always associated with the worship of idols. The ultimate false change of direction is idolatry, a turning aside after a vain thing that cannot help (1 S. 12:21).[10]

Isa. 8:11 does not specify more closely the way of the people from which God deters the prophet, though considering the context it seems to refer to political alliances that betray a lack of trust in God. According to Mal. 2:8, it is the priests who have turned aside "from the way" by causing many to stumble by their instruction.

2. *Deviation from the Commandments.* The way commanded by Yahweh is the way of statutes, hence the admonition is often issued to turn away from the commandments "neither to the right nor to the left" (Dt. 17:20; Josh. 1:7; 23:6). "David" asserts that he has kept the ways of Yahweh, has kept his ordinances before him, and has not turned aside from his statutes (2 S. 22:22f.; the parallel passage in Ps. 18 uses the hiphil, asserting that he did not allow the statutes to depart from him; cf. also 1 K. 15:5). A person can turn aside from the law of the Lord (Ps. 119:102; Dnl. 9:5,11; Mal. 3:7), as well

---

10. → יעל *yʿl,* VI, 146.

as from the commandments of the king (2 Ch. 8;15), the instructions of a teacher (Prov. 5:7; 22:6), or the decisions of a judge (Dt. 17:11).

3. *Deviation from Yahweh.* Deviation from the way or from the statutes is also a deviation from Yahweh himself. Thus we read that the wicked "turned aside from following him, and had no regard for any of his ways" (Job 34:27); Hezekiah "held fast to Yahweh; he did not depart from following him, but kept the commandments that Yahweh commanded Moses" (2 K. 18:6). In contrast, Amaziah did turn away from Yahweh (2 Ch. 25:27). "Cursed is the man whose heart turns away from Yahweh" (Jer. 17:5); but whoever fears Yahweh will not turn from him (Jer. 32:40). 1 S. 12:20 also equates turning aside from Yahweh with idolatry, with Samuel saying to the people: "Do not turn aside from following Yahweh . . . do not turn aside after vain things that cannot profit or save" (cf. Dt. 7:4; 2 Ch. 34:33; Ezk. 6:9).

Jer. 17:13 contains the difficult sentence *y^e^sûray bā'āreṣ yikkāṯēḇû.* The *Qere* reads *w^e^sûray,* which is no less problematical. Perhaps a *w* has been put in the wrong place, and one should read *w^e^sārāw:* "and those who turn aside from him shall be written in the netherworld (?)." This would correspond to *kol ʿōz^e^ḇêḵā* in v. 13a.

Hos. 7:14 is also problematical. The text reads *yāsûrû ḇî.* Since *sûr* is not otherwise associated with *b^e^,* some interpreters have followed the LXX and Targ. in reading *yāsōrû* (from *srr*), though *sārar b^e^* is also a hapax legomenon. According to Dahood, this represents a Ugariticism.[11] Since Ugar. *b* also means "from," one might translate: "they have turned aside from me." The context involves mourning rites associated with the cult of Baʿal, i.e., adherence to other gods.

Jer. 5:23 and Ps. 14:3 use *sûr* absolutely. The prophet accuses the people of being stubborn and rebellious, and adds: "they have turned aside and gone away *(hlk).*" According to the psalmist, Yahweh looks at his people and finds none that seeks God: "they all have gone astray together, they are corrupt *(ne'^e^laḥ),* there is none that does good" (the par. passage Ps. 53:4[3] uses *sāḡ* [from *sûḡ*] with similar meaning). Jer. 6:28 also associates depravity (here *šḥt* hiphil; cf. Ps. 14:1) and turning aside. One is tempted to identify the verb *srr* twice in *sārê sôr^e^rîm,* and many thus emend the text to *sōr^e^rê sôr^e^rîm,* a kind of superlative meaning "extraordinarily stubborn people."[12] But *sôr^e^rîm* more likely represents an abstract plural,[13] "stubbornness," yielding the translation "apostates with stubbornness." Prov. 11:22 contains a similar construction: a beautiful woman *w^e^sāraṯ* (fem. ptcp. of *sûr) ṭaʿam;* i.e., to deviate with regard to tact, without discretion, is compared with the gold ring in a swine's snout.

4. *Deviation from the Way of the Father.* Accounts of the kings of Judah and Israel often conclude with a brief judgment on their conduct. In the Deuteronomistic history, such evaluation of the kings of the northern kingdom is usually negative, as in the ste-

11. "Northwest Semitic Philology and Three Biblical Texts," *JNSL* 2 (1972) 20.
12. *GK,* §133i.
13. *GK,* §123d,e.

reotypical formula: "So-and-so followed in the sins of Jeroboam and did not turn aside *(sûr)* from them." The reference is always to the bull cult in Bethel and Dan (2 K. 10:29). This formula is used in reference to Jehu, Jehoahaz, Jehoash, Jeroboam II, Zechariah, Menahem, Pekahiah, and Pekah (2 K. 10:31; 13:2,11; 14:24; 15:9,18,24, 28). The people also allegedly did not turn aside from the sins of Jeroboam (2 K. 17:22; 13:6). Jeroboam was the founder of the sanctuaries in Dan and Bethel, and was viewed as the "father" of all apostasy.

In the positive evaluation of Josiah, David is the "father" of the faithful; he walked completely in the way of his father David, "and he did not turn aside to the right or to the left" (2 K. 22:2; 2 Ch. 34:2). We read similarly that Jehoshaphat "walked in all the way of Asa his father; he did not turn aside from it, doing what was right in the sight of Yahweh" (1 K. 22:43; 2 Ch. 20:32).

5. *Yahweh Turns Aside from Individuals.* With Yahweh as its subject, *sûr* indicates that God "turns away from" a person, withdraws, and no longer aids that person. Thus does Yahweh leave Samson and Saul (Jgs. 16:20; 1 S. 16:14; 18:12; 28:15; 2 S. 7:15). Earlier it is said that the Spirit of Yahweh comes on both (Jgs. 13:25; 14:19; 15:14; 1 S. 10:6; cf. in contrast the evil spirit in 1 S. 16:23). A false prophet denies that the Spirit of Yahweh has left him in order to speak to Micaiah ben Imlah (1 K. 22:24; 2 Ch. 18:23).

In Hos. 9:12 *b*^e*śûrî* should probably be understood as *b*^e*sûrî:*[14] "when I turn away from them," i.e., withdraw my help from them. The assertion is more specific when Yahweh's anger (Ezk. 16:42) or steadfast love (2 S. 7:15) turns away from someone.

God's nearness, however, can also be perceived as a burden. Thus Job says: "Depart from us, we do not desire the knowledge of your ways" (Job 21:14; cf. 22:17); in other words, we want nothing to do with you.

6. *Turning Aside from Evil.* Finally, wisdom literature also addresses the necessity of turning away from evil. The teacher instructs his "son" and shows him how he should travel the correct path: "Fear Yahweh, and turn away from evil" (Prov. 3:7). "A wise man is cautious and turns away from evil" (14:16). "By the fear of Yahweh a person avoids evil" (16:6). The avoidance of evil is understanding (Job 28:28). We read that Job "feared God, and turned away from evil" (1:1,8; 2:3). The hiphil is also used: "Do not swerve *(nāṭâ)* to the right or to the left; let your foot turn away *(hāsēr)* from evil" (Prov. 4:27).

Wicked people embody that evil which one is to avoid, hence the cry: "Depart from me, you evildoers, that I may keep the commandments of my God" (Ps. 119:115). Ps. 139:19 has a different focus, with the psalmist demanding that the "men of blood" no longer harass him (cf. Ps. 6:9[8]). One should avoid trafficking with the wicked, lest one be visited by the same punishment as they (Nu. 16:26; cf. 1 S. 15:6). By following the teaching of the wise, one may avoid *(sûr)* the snares of death (Prov. 13:14) or the realm of death beneath (15:24).

---

14. See I above.

Viewed positively, turning away from evil is the same as doing good (Ps. 34:15[14]; 37:27). The person who turns away from evil and guards his way preserves his own life (Prov. 16:17). It is the sign of bad times when a person who avoids evil is exploited (Isa. 59:15).

The notion that the wicked cannot escape *(sûr)* darkness is familiar in wisdom literature (Job 15:30a). The second *yāsûr* in this verse, however, is problematical: *wᵉyāsûr bᵉrûaḥ pîw* (RSV, freely translated: "will be swept away"). Dahood associates v. 30c with the negation *lō'* in v. 30a, translating: "nor will he escape from its massive mouth."[15] A. van Selms reads *yiššōr* from a postulated *nšr* (cf. Arab. *nasara,* "take away"), translating: "he takes him away by the breath of his mouth."[16]

IV. *sārâ.* The subst. *sārâ* occurs 8 times, and many derive it from *sûr,* translating it as "apostasy, defection, turning away." *HAL,* however, associates it in 7 instances with *srr,* "be stubborn, rebellious."[17] Both suggestions are possible, and the meaning is approximately the same. The expression *dibber sārâ ʿal* suggests a derivation from *srr:* "preach rebellion against Yahweh" (Dt. 13:6[5]; Jer. 29:32; 28:16; in the latter passage, *ʿal* should be read instead of *'el*). Isa. 59:13 speaks of *ʿōšeq wᵉsārâ,* and the continuing context speaks of transgression and rebellion *(pešaʿ),* denial (*kḥš* piel), and turning away (*sûg* niphal) from God, all of which suggests the interpretation "turning aside, apostasy." *HAL* suggests "speak falsely" (cf. Akk. *sarrātim dabābu,* "tell lies").[18] Isa. 31:6 advises to "turn to him from whom the Israelites have so deeply committed *sārâ.*" Here both "turning aside, apostasy," and "rebellion" are possible. Isa. 1:4 accuses Judah of having forsaken *(ʿāzaḇ)* Yahweh, despised (*n'ṣ* piel) the Holy One of Israel, and retreated (*zûr* niphal). This same movement is mentioned in v. 5 with *sārâ,* "falling away" (from *sûr*). Dt. 19:16 speaks of a false witness *(ʿēḏ ḥāmās)* who speaks *sārâ; HAL* follows E. Jenni in translating "to make a false declaration (in court)," while G. von Rad translates "to accuse him of wrongdoing" ("turning aside, apostasy," is also possible here).[19] The expression *lō' sārâ* (derived from *sûr*) in Isa. 14:6 is usually translated "without ceasing," though it could just as easily be translated "without deviation": he does not miss the mark.

V. Qumran. The term *sûr* occurs about 40 times in the Damascus Document and the Qumran literature. Here we find biblical expressions such as "turn aside from the way," with and without "to the right or left" (1QS 3:10; 9:20; CD 1:13,15; 8:4; 4QFlor [4Q174] 1-3, I, 14), "turn aside from commandments" (1QS 1:15; 8:17), from the Torah (CD 16:9; 1QH 15:11; 11QT 56:7), from unrighteousness (1QS 6:15), and in one instance from "the way of the people" (CD 8:16, as in Isa. 8:11). 1QSa 1:2 speaks of those who refused to walk in the way of the people. As in Isa. 7:17, the schism in the

15. "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," 343.
16. *Job I (1–21). POT* (1982), 137.
17. *HAL,* II, 769.
18. *HAL,* II, 769; *AHw,* I, 147a; II, 1031b.
19. *HAL,* II, 769; Jenni, "Dtn 18,16"; G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 127.

Solomonic kingdom is described with *sûr:* "since the day that Ephraim departed from Judah" (CD 7:12; 14:1: *sār* is written here with *ś*). In 3 instances, 1QM speaks concretely about the enemy vanishing (1:6; 9:2; 18:11).

The term *sārâ* occurs in 4QCat[a] (4Q177) frs. 1–4:14 with a meaning close to that in Dt. 19:16 (see above). 11QT 20:6 uses *sûr* hiphil to refer to the removal of the entrails from sacrificial meat (cf. Lev. 4:31,35 hophal). 11QT 56:19 cites Dt. 17:16; 11QT 63:12 is a free rendering of Dt. 21:13.

Snijders

סות *swt*

Contents: I. Occurrences and Etymology. II. Basic Meaning. III. Usage. IV. Summary.

I. Occurrences and Etymology. The root *swt* (only in the hiphil) occurs in the OT in the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic literature, and subsequently in the Chronicler's writing, as well as in the biographical portions of the prophetic books (Isaiah, Jeremiah) and in the book of Job.

No reliable etymology can be provided, since this root is not attested in any other Semitic idiom and since historical connections are discernible neither within nor outside Hebrew. This root was originally biconsonantal and was in part expanded into a hollow root (II *w*) (in 12 instances), and in part expanded by the augment *n* with progressive assimilation in the hiphil imperfect and participle (in 6 instances).

II. Basic Meaning. According to W. von Soden the II *w* verbs indicate "the transition or conversion from one condition into the opposite" (*dâktum,* "kill"; *mâtum,* "die"; *târum,* "turn around," etc.).[1] Accordingly, *swt* hiphil has the basic meaning "be converted/changed from one course/behavior into the opposite one." This sense probably appears most concretely in the statement, "and Yahweh helped him [Jehoshaphat] and *turned them* [the attacking enemy] *away from him*" (2 Ch. 18:31). An emendation with *BHS* following the LXX (Syr., Targ., Vulg.) to *way*^{e}*sîrēm* is thus unnecessary.

In contrast, the root with the augment *n* inclines more to the semantic nuance "seduce in the political sense."[2] It is used in this sense in 4 parallel passages in reference to Hezekiah, who in the opinion of the Assyrian Rabshakeh is seducing his people into rebellion with false political and religious hopes (2 K. 18:32 par. Isa. 36:18 par. 2 Ch. 32:11,15).

---

swt. A. Oepke, "ἀπατάω κτλ.," *TDNT,* I, 384f.; W. von Soden, "*n* als Wurzelaugment im Semitischen," *WZ Halle* 17 (1968) 175-84.

1. *GaG,* §104d.
2. Von Soden, "*n* als Wurzelaugment," 181f.

The LXX renders this root with the augment *n* 5 times with *apatáō*,[3] which in secular Greek has the sense of "entice, deceive," along with *exapatáō* and in connection with *pseúdos*. Elsewhere the LXX uses *apatáō* as an equivalent for *hiššî'*, "deceive" (Gen. 3:13; Isa. 37:10; Jer. 4:10). In other passages *swt* is translated by Gk. *episeíō*, "stir up, incite" (4 times), or with other words.

Parallel terms to *swt* include → נטה *nāṭâ* hiphil, "turn aside, seduce" (Job 36:18), and also → נשׁא *nš'* II hiphil, "cheat, deceive" (2 Ch. 32:15), as well as → יכל *yāḵōl*, "be superior," here in the sense of "oblige, coerce" (Jer. 38:22), and even → מכר *mkr* hithpael, "let oneself be sold, condescend to do something, give oneself up for something" (1 K. 21:25; cf. v. 20). Use of the verb *swt* thus suggests the sense "move or mislead someone into doing something against that person's will and original intentions, delude someone." This root is not used in the OT in the sense of sexual seduction.

III. Usage. The form of such misleading influence is understandably largely an interpersonal process.

1. *Subjects*. As a rule, the subject of such influence is a person: a biological brother or relative (Dt. 13:7[Eng. v. 6], an unnamed person (1 S. 26:19), a concrete person such as Achsah (Josh. 15:18 par. Jgs. 1:14), Hezekiah (2 K. 18:32 par. Isa. 36:18 par. 2 Ch. 32:11,15), Jezebel (1 K. 21:25), Ahab (2 Ch. 18:2), friends and advisers (Jer. 38:22), Baruch (Jer. 43:3).

2. *Objects*. Objects are also persons: collectively the people itself (the subject being Hezekiah), individually Othniel (Achsah), Saul (an unnamed subject), Ahab (Jezebel), Jehoshaphat (Ahab), Jeremiah ([allegedly] Baruch), Zedekiah (his friends and advisers).

In a few instances God/Yahweh himself, viewed anthropomorphically, can also mislead people: presumably Saul (1 S. 26:19), David (2 S. 24:1), Jehoshaphat's enemies (2 Ch. 18:31), and Job (Job 36:16). In 1 Ch. 21:1 Satan assumes the role of David's seducer, deceiving him into undertaking a census. According to Job 2:3, Satan even persuades Yahweh himself to test Job's steadfastness and wisdom. Finally, according to Job 36:16, extraordinary circumstances — unlimited abundance, boundless well-being — can mislead a person.

3. *Forms*. The attempt to seduce someone into involuntary behavior is always structured *verbally*. The seducer does not employ force or pressure, but rather persuades. "If your brother, your son or your daughter . . . entices you secretly, saying, 'Let us go and serve other gods,' which neither you nor your fathers have known . . ." (Dt. 13:7[6]). Jezebel's seduction of Ahab is preceded by the queen whispering to him (1 K. 21:7,25). The warning of the Assyrian parliamentarian Rabshakeh culminates in the statement: "Do not listen to Hezekiah," presupposing that Hezekiah delivers a political address to his own people. But the Rabshakeh's promises in the event of Jerusalem's capitulation

---

3. Oepke, 384f.

constitute no less an attempt at political seduction: "until I come and take you away to a land like your own land, a land of grain and wine, a land of bread and vineyards, a land of olive trees and honey, that you may live, and not die" (2 K. 18:32).

The book of Job describes in detail the verbal duel between Satan and Yahweh, with the goal of persuading Yahweh to test Job by withdrawing from him and visiting afflictions on him (Job 1:8-11; 2:2-6). Nonverbal seduction, of course, is involved in any attempt to mislead a person — including Job here — with enticing pleasantries such as the alleviation of hardship or beguiling with well-being (36:10,18). Force is not used in these cases, but rather only words or seductive circumstances that mislead a person into originally unintended behavior. Strictly speaking, the substance of the conversation between the serpent and Adam's wife (Gen. 3:1-5), with its goal of seducing the human being into partaking of the forbidden fruit, exhibits all the characteristics of the concept *swt,* though without being so described (cf. Gen. 3:13, where the parallel term *hiššî'* is used). The human being resists at first, but is then brought around to engage in forbidden behavior by the serpent's beguiling words and by the seductive appearance of the fruit itself.[4] Chastisement follows immediately (Gen. 3:12-19). In this way the concept of *swt* encompasses not only the process itself of deluding or persuading someone but also its disastrous consequences.

4. *Intentions.* The intention of seduction is always destructive, seeking to bring a person down a path that is neither intended nor wanted nor advantageous to that person, one that is perceived rather as ill-advised and later also proves to be such. Such deviation runs contrary to divine will and to the pious judgment and wise understanding of a person. Moses warns his listeners against allowing themselves to be persuaded by apostate family members into transgressing against Yahweh's commandment and joining a foreign cult (Dt. 13:7[6]). According to the Assyrian, Hezekiah is misleading the people of Jerusalem and Judah, contrary to all sound political judgment and to their own detriment, into trusting in their God Yahweh (2 K. 18:32 par. Isa. 36:18 par. 2 Ch. 32:11,15). Jezebel persuades Ahab to violate traditional, sanctified property rights in Israel (1 K. 21:25).[5] Ahab of Israel persuades Jehoshaphat of Judah into undertaking a campaign with him against Ramoth-gilead (2 Ch. 18:2); he himself is killed in the campaign, and the alliance is reckoned to Jehoshaphat as sacrilege (2 Ch. 19:2). Zedekiah's friends and counselors incite him, against his own judgment as well as against Jeremiah's advice, into resisting the Babylonians (Jer. 38:22), resulting not only in the king's death and the fall of Jerusalem and Judah but also in a loss of the dynasty itself (2 K. 25:1-21). The Judean refugees insinuate that Jeremiah's warning against retreating to Egypt is based actually on Baruch's whisperings, the intention being to deliver all of them into the hands of the Babylonians (Jer. 43:3). In this sense *swt* refers not only to a seduction into undertaking something (bad) but also a seduction against something (good), all of which must end badly.

---

4. → חמד *ḥāmad (chāmadh),* III.1 (IV, 456f.).
5. Cf. A. Alt, *Der Stadtstaat Samaria. BSAW* 101/5 (1954) = *KlSchr,* III (1959), 258-302.

5. *Theological Usage.* Only rarely is *swt* applied to Yahweh and thus used theologically. Thus David considers it at least possible that Yahweh himself has stirred up Saul to pursue him (1 S. 26:19). Yahweh also provokes David into undertaking a census, even though knowledge of the number of persons among his people is obviously reserved for Yahweh alone (2 S. 24:1). This portrayal presumably represents the attempt to trace a terrible pestilence (2 S. 24:10-17), understood as punishment, back to an incomprehensibly presumptuous act on the part of David, while at the same time to establish etiologically the holy place in Jerusalem through the theophany, David's encounter with the pestilence angel (2 S. 24:16). In contrast, 1 Ch. 21:1 interprets such seduction of David, which it perceives as quite malicious, as the work of Satan. In a similar fashion, Satan does indeed also set out to persuade Yahweh into testing Job's integrity and wisdom through suffering affecting his property, physical person, and honor (Job 2:3). The author of the framework narrative of the book of Job was not really able to attribute such a questionable undertaking to Yahweh, and transferred it instead to Satan (Job 1:8-11; 2:2-6).

IV. Summary. This theological corrective of transferring such beguiling from Yahweh to Satan shows that the concept *swt* — as the expression of objectionable seduction — encompasses both the enticement to transgress against a familiar order (or at least one perceived to be valid) and the burdensome consequences. Such an undertaking is always negative, disrupting order and destroying life, and always ends up damaging the person so beguiled and proving disadvantageous to the community at large (as in the case of Zedekiah).

Yahweh is presented as the subject of such seduction, however, only under the presupposition that Yahweh sovereignly holds human history in his hands, and in the final analysis is able to turn things for the better (cf. Job 42:7-17). One can proceed on the assumption that his good intentions remain unbroken despite attendant temptations (2 S. 24:10-17). In this case such seduction by Yahweh can also be evaluated in the sense of his salvific will, thus resembling affliction by stubbornness or hardness of heart as initiated by Yahweh.[6]

Wallis

---

6. → חזק *ḥāzaq (chāzaq),* III.5 (IV, 308); cf. also A. S. van der Woude, "חזק *ḥzq* to be firm," *TLOT,* I, 405; → כבד *kāḇēḏ,* II.3.d (VII, 20f.); → קשה *qāšâ.*

סָחַר *sāḥar;* סַחַר *saḥar;* סְחֹרָה *s^e^ḥōrâ;* סֹחֵרָה *sōḥērâ*

Contents: I. Cognates. II. *sôḥēr.* III. *saḥar.* IV. The Verb. V. *sōḥērâ* and (Aramaic) Qumran Evidence. VI. LXX.

I. Cognates. Reliable cognates occur only in Akkadian, Aramaic, and Syriac. The meaning is uncertain for the Ugar. PN *sḫr(n),* and for Pun. *sḥr, sḥrt.*[1] In Akkadian the verb *saḫāru* exhibits an extremely broad semantic scope, beginning with "turn, turn around, repeat," or, with reference to persons, "go around."[2] The subst. *saḫ(ḫ)iru* refers (rarely) to a loiterer or peddler; from a sociohistorical perspective this seems to have been preserved in Middle Heb. *sōḥēr.* The ptcp. *sāḫiru* means "going around, surrounding," *siḫru* means "border, perimeter," and *siḫirtu* "surroundings, environs, totality." Finally, the (rare) term *saḫi/ertum* seems to refer to some sort of merchandise.

Jewish Aram. *sḥr* means "go around, engage in trade." Christian Palestinian Aram. and Syr. *sḥr* pael mean "go around as a beggar." Mand. *sahura* refers to a beggar, and Syrian Arab. *m^e^saḥḥer* refers to the person who during Ramadan goes from house to house waking people.[3] One might also mention Aram. *s^e^ḥôr,* "round about," as well as *s^e^ḥôrâ,* "trade, merchandise," Old Aram. *sḥrh,* Jewish Aram. *saḥrānûṯ,* "surroundings, environs," and Arab. *saḥira,* "get up early, go" (but: *saḥara,* "conjure, perform magic"; cf. Heb. *šḥr*).[4]

II. *sôḥēr.* Because of its straightforwardness, it is best to begin with the nominalized participle, which occurs 16 times (in Isa. 47:15 one should follow B. Duhm in reading *šōḥ^a^rayiḵ;* but one should emend Ezk. 27:15 with the conj. *sōḥ^a^rōṯ;* see below).[5] The feminine participle is used only in reference to collectives (Ezk. 27:12,16,18,15 conj.; see below). Hence let us first cite the meaning of the masculine participle ("merchant, buying agent"), which is not problematic. 1 K. 10:28 (2 Ch. 1:16) mentions traders/buying agents of the king; their exceptional reference might, if the usual conj. *Qô'* is correct, have something to do with the long distances they had to traverse. In any event, something similar also applies to the Midianite traders in Gen. 37:28, who were

---

sāḥar. W. F. Albright, "Abram the Hebrew," *BASOR* 163 (1961) 36-54; C. H. Gordon, "Abraham and the Merchants of Ura," *JNES* 17 (1958) 28-31; A. A. Macintosh, "Psalm XCI 4 and the Root *sḥr,*" *VT* 23 (1973) 56-62; E. A. Speiser, "The Verb *SHR* in Genesis and Early Hebrew Movements," *BASOR* 164 (1961) 23-28; T. L. Thompson, *The Historicity of the Patriarchal Narratives. BZAW* 133 (1974), 172f., 183f.

1. *DNSI,* II, 782.
2. *CAD,* XV, 37ff., alone enumerates 19 possibilities; cf. specifically *AHw,* II, 1005ff.; *CAD,* XV, 43-46.
3. All references *HAL,* II, 749f.
4. For Aramaic see Dalman, *ANH,* 287; for Old Aramaic see Sefire, *KAI,* 224:7f.
5. *Jesaja. HKAT* III/1 (1902), in loc. Macintosh takes a different view.

encountered on the way to Egypt near Dothan, northwest of Shechem (Tell Dotha), and apparently also to the merchants/buyers of Tarshish (Ezk. 38:13, probably Tartessus/southern Spain).[6] Similarly, Isa. 23:2 mentions the "merchant of Sidon, who passed over the sea" (so MT; LXX has pl.; 1QIsa[a] differs; see below concerning *saḥar*). Tyre functions virtually as a paradigm for expansive trading relations in Ezk. 27. From a sociohistorical perspective, it is noteworthy that Isa. 23:8 calls Sidon's merchants/buyers *śārîm*, i.e., either high officials or highly placed persons from the upper classes. (Was that so different in Israel during the monarchy? Cf. 1 K. 20:34. Unfortunately, evidence is too sparse.)

Ezk. 27 requires more detailed analysis not only because of the variety of usage but also because of the parallelism *sôḥēr/rôḵēl, sôḥereṯ/rôḵeleṯ*. (1) One should follow Zimmerli in viewing vv. 12-24 as an insertion (one prompting additional addenda).[7] Its basis is a list of Tyrian imports (exports are not mentioned). Because of this insertion into a preexisting context, one can probably not be quite certain that the list is preserved in its entirety. (2) Zimmerli has ascertained that this list probably nowhere refers to a trade partnership but rather always to commercial help from other cities/peoples/lands commissioned by Tyre, hence "buyers, buying."[8] (3) The term *sôḥereṯ* (but not *sôḥēr!*) is always associated with some justification, e.g., in v. 12 Tarshish "because of the great wealth of every kind" (*hôn*, from Tyre), v. 16 Edom "because of abundant trade" (*maʿaśêḵā*, products?), v. 18 Damascus, with both expressions as enticement to put oneself at disposal as buyer. V. 15 (conj.) lacks this kind of justification; it must be so, however, since "Rhodes" and many coastlands, surprisingly, are to deliver tribute (*'eškār*) instead of the usual goods. Is this a reference to some sort of political/mercantile dependency? It should also be noted that only in v. 15 do the two roots *sḥr* and *rkl* occur together. (4) A semantic distinction between *sôḥēr* and *rôḵēl* in this list has not yet been discerned (*HAL*, in contrast: wholesaler/retailer).[9] V. 3 refers to Tyre with its expansive trade relationships as *rôḵeleṯ hāʿammîm* (probably an addendum), so that one is advised not to take differences in trade volume as the point of departure. But we encounter *yāḏēḵ* only in combination with *sḥr* (v. 21: *sōḥarê yāḏēḵ;* v. 15 conj.: *sōḥarôṯ yāḏēḵ*). This might indicate that *sôḥēr/sôḥereṯ* derives more from the extensive traveling activity of the merchant, and that *yāḏēḵ* adds to this an understandable reference to reliability, while *rôḵēl/rôḵeleṯ* derives more from the sense of mercantile activity (dealing, selling). Because of the peculiarities of the list, one probably cannot without further investigation generalize beyond this differentiation between *sḥr* and *rkl* regarding their usage.

We can add here that Prov. 31:14 mentions merchant ships, and Gen. 23:16 silver, commonly used among merchants (fixed in its value as currency). If one were to summarize the use of *sôḥēr*, one might refer to an "itinerant merchant, traveling dealer," addressing thus its specific difference from *rôḵēl*.

---

6. Cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 65.
7. Ibid., in loc.
8. Ibid., 63.
9. *HAL*, II, 750.

III. *saḥar.* The term *saḥar* (const. *sᵉḥar*) refers to the profit from trade or itinerant business.[10] Its synonyms include *yāg̱îa'* and *tᵉḇû'â* (Isa. 23:3; see below). Isa. 45:14 demonstrates this quite well: "The revenues of Egypt and the trade profits of Cush." Prov. 3:14 contains both direct and figurative usage in one: "For the gain from it is better (for wisdom) than gain from silver" — also quite appropriate insofar as wisdom, too, represented an itinerant phenomenon.

The use in Isa. 23:18 is clear enough, albeit discredited by the metaphor "wages of a harlot": "Referring back to the simile introduced in vv. 15f., he [i.e., the one who added vv. 17f.] calls the highly profitable trade 'playing the harlot.' . . . Since the profits of trade are only referred to metaphorically as the rewards of prostitution, Deut. 23:18 does not apply to them."[11] Thus Tyre (like the nations in Ps. 96:8; Isa. 60:9-11; Hag. 2:7; Zec. 14:21) is to bring its treasures to Jerusalem for the enjoyment of those who dwell before Yahweh.

The occurrences in 1 K. 10:15; Prov. 31:18; and Isa. 23:3 are problematical. Although the text in 1 K. 10:15 is obviously corrupt,[12] the reading *missaḥar hārōḵᵉlîm* is probably reliable, "(besides) the trading profits of the merchants" (2 Ch. 9:14 changes *msḥr* to *sḥrm,* so that *rklm* and *sḥrm* are mentioned together as in Ezk. 27). Without dependable information concerning the context, however, we can deduce very little that is reliable, as much as we would like to know more about the revenues of such merchants (*rōḵᵉlîm,* not *sōḥᵃrîm*).

Isa. 23:2f. is also severely corrupt, though the pertinent verse in this context, v. 3b, does yield a good translation: "It [Sidon] became the (itinerant) profit of nations." But most scholars elide *wattᵉhî,* since the LXX does not attest it and it can be explained as a result of dittography of the consonants *th* from the preceding word. In my opinion, however, this reconstruction does not yield good sense, since the translation "his income [was] the profit from trade with the peoples" represents a sentence composed of two synonyms, and the alternative, "the grain of Shihor [the harvest of the Nile] is its gain, the profit of the nations," does not constitute real parallelism.[13] Kaiser's assumption seems correct that "grain of Shihor, harvest of the Nile" are doublets (the LXX does not read "Nile" — was this successively appended?).[14] Most scholars take the first two words in v. 3 with v. 2b, so that one maintains v. 3 MT and for the most part also the consonants in v. 2, then reading vv. 2f. as follows: "Wail, you inhabitants of the coast, you buyers [LXX] of Sidon!/they passed over [1QIsa[a]] the sea as messengers *(mal'āḵîm)* [v. 3]: and on many waters./The grain of Shihor [the harvest of the Nile] — their [Sidon's] gain! It became the profit of nations."[15] According to this rendering, the

10. Ibid.

11. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 171f.

12. M. Noth, *Könige 1–16. BK* IX/1 (1968), in loc.; nonetheless, J. Gray, *I and II Kings.* OTL (^{2}1970), in loc., considers the text reliable, though he does not address Noth's concerns.

13. For the former see H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1997), 404. For the latter see Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39,* 160 and n. e.

14. A different view is taken by Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 403f., with bibliography.

15. Cf. also W. Rudolph, "Jesaja 23:1-14," *FS F. Baumgärtel. EdF* A 10 (1959), 168, cited by Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27,* 406.

grain of Egypt, as the crown of distant, also maritime, trade relations, is referred to as Sidon's gain, gain with reference to which (or from which?) the change (cf. v. 4) then comes about, reducing Sidon to the profit of tourists.[16]

Prov. 31:18 can be translated without reservation as "her profit is good." This profit is attained by the clever wife through the products mentioned in the context, not through travelling activity. The meaning "profit" here seems to have acquired an independence detached from OT *sôḥēr.*

IV. The Verb. The verb (5 occurrences) has in its scarcity undergone an interpretation based on the participle, though this interpretation lacks other evidence.[17] Although cognates especially from Akkadian make the basic meaning "pass through, etc.," relatively certain (the Aramaic and Syriac might be secondarily influenced), the attendant debate is probably not without value, since it draws attention to a particular nuance in usage.

As is well known, Jer. 14:18b MT presents problems. As a result of the elision of a *w* before the second clause, the LXX yields good sense: "Priest and prophet pass over into a land that they did not know." The line would admittedly be thrown into relief over against the previously described horror, and might possibly represent a gloss. One can understand the MT without conjecture as a qal of *s^eḥarḥar* (Ps. 38:11[10], violent beating of the heart): "Priest and prophet turn to and fro toward the land [because the word of God is not in Jerusalem]; but they have no knowledge."[18]

Gen. 42:34 intends something similar. Although the feared Egyptian ruler had suspected Jacob's sons of espionage, when they bring along their youngest brother as proof of their honesty — *tisḥārû,* i.e., they were able to move about in the land without further making themselves suspicious of espionage. Such moving about no longer had to be undertaken on a fixed route in order not to awaken suspicion. Gen. 34:21 refers to the same thing. Shechem wants to persuade the leading men of the city that the Jacobites are not dangerous, and that intermarriage can be recommended. The acc. obj. "land" here does not suggest commercial activity but rather use of the openness of the land lying "before them."[19] If they were not peaceful, precisely such access would have to be prevented.

In contrast, Gen. 34:10 is clearly formulated differently than v. 21.[20] In connection with v. 9, whose resemblance to Dt. 7:2f. is unmistakable, v. 10 emphasizes the settlement of the Jacobites (*yšb* as the framework, the P expression *hē'āḥ^azû* as culmination), whereas in v. 21 such dwelling does not exhibit the more committed character of sedentary living, and v. 23 emphasizes only the ownership of flocks or herds. Only in v. 10 is there an inclination to consider commercial activity, since it refers so clearly to

16. Concerning the pertinent historical circumstances, cf. Kaiser and Wildberger, in loc.

17. See Gordon, Albright; cf. Speiser.

18. Cf. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII (³1968), in loc.; and the basic meaning of Akk. *saḫāru.*

19. Contra Speiser.

20. H. Holzinger, *Genesis. KHC* I (1898), in loc.

the acquisition of property. Here too, however, the acc. obj. "land" allows no other translation than elsewhere.

V. *sōḥērâ* and (Aramaic) Qumran Evidence. Ps. 91:4 does not itself offer any reliable clues to the meaning of *sōḥērâ.* In its position as a parallel to *ṣinnâ,* "large shield," it can mean many things. Neither does the context offer much help, since v. 4b stands in an isolated position. Macintosh believes there can be no doubt concerning derivation from the root *sḥr* in the sense of "surround, encircle, encompass" (cf. Akk. *saḫāru* as well as *siḫru* and *siḫirtu*). If this is indeed the case, then it seems more correct to understand "encompassing one" (so Aquila, literally) not as supernatural protection but rather as a protective wall enclosing round about, since the preceding shield leads one to expect something more concrete.[21]

In any case, here one may add several Aramaic occurrences from Qumran (none attested in Hebrew): 4Q213 (4QTLevi[a] ar) 6:1: May the wall of your salvation be round about me *(s[e]ḥôr);* 2Q24 (2QNJ ar) 1:2 (bis): an arcade round about a block of houses; 5Q15 (5QNJ ar) fr. 1, 2:3,(4),5: a spiral staircase winding about a pillar *(sḥr);* cf. also Syr. *s[e]ḥarṯā',* "fortress, enclosed ramparts."[22]

In addition, *sḥrt* in 1QapGen 21:16-18 (3 times) refers to a distant journey (with *msḥr* twice in 21:15), and the distant (circling?) course of the stars in 4Q210 (4QEnAstr[b] ar) 23:6: the stars of heaven assemble in the north, complete one circuit *(sḥryn),* and turn toward the eastern heavens; similarly also 4Q206 (4QEn[e] ar) fr. 1, 20:1 (on 1 En. 18:15) and (with reference to tongues of fire) 4Q204 (4QEn[c] ar) fr. 1, 6:22 (on 1 En. 14:9).

V. LXX. The LXX probably had no trouble with this root when it consistently rendered the passages with *emporeúesthai* and its nominal derivatives. The term *metabolḗ ktl.* also derives from the semantic field of commerce. In Ps. 91:4 the basic etymological meaning comes through again in the rendering *hóplǭ kyklṓsei se hē alḗtheia autoú.*

Seebass

21. *HAL,* II, 750, contra Macintosh, on the basis of context and Isa. 47:15, which is a questionable parallel; see II above.

22. *KBL*[2]; H. Gunkel, *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 ([5]1968 = [4]1926), in loc.

סִינַי sînay

Contents: I. Occurrences: 1. Sinai; 2. Horeb; 3. Mount of God. II. Etymological Derivation. III. Oldest Understanding: 1. Theological Considerations; 2. Idiomatic Considerations *(zeh sînay);* 3. Geographical Considerations. IV. Literary-Critical and Traditio-Historical Problems. V. The Sinai Event in the Pentateuch Sources: 1. Yahwist; 2. Elohist; 3. JE; 4. Deuteronomist; 5. Priestly. VI. Suggested Locations: 1. Serbal; 2. Volcano Hypothesis; 3. Around Kadesh-barnea; 4. Traditional View (Jebel Mûsā).

---

sînay. Y. Aharoni, "Kadesch-Barnea und der Berg Sinai," *Die Wüste Gottes: Entdeckungen auf Sinai,* ed. B. Rothenberg, Y. Aharoni, and A. Hashimshoni (Munich/Zurich, 1961), 107-71; L Bäck, "סנה und סִינַי," *MGWJ* 46, N.S. 10 (1902) 299-301; C. T. Beke, *Mount Sinai a Volcano* (London, ²1873); idem, *The Late Dr. Charles Beke's Discoveries of Sinai in Arabia and of Midian* (London, 1878); W. Beyerlin, *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinai Traditions* (Eng. trans., Oxford, ²1965); A. F. Bönhoff, "Die Wanderung Israels in der Wüste mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Frage 'Wo lag der Sinai?'" *TSK* 80 (1907) 159-217; H. Cazelles, "Alliance du Sinaï, alliance de l'Horeb et renouvellement d'alliance," *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. FS W. Zimmerli* (Göttingen, 1977), 69-79; G. I. Davies, "Hagar, el-Heğra and the Location of Mount Sinai," *VT* 22 (1972) 152-63; E. Dennert, "War der Sinai ein Vulkan?" *Glauben und Wissen. Volkstümliche Blätter zur Verteidigung und Vertiefung des christlichen Weltbildes* 2 (1904), 298-306; C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot: Seine Entstehung und seine Entwicklung im AT. BBB* 62 (1985); O. Eissfeldt, "Die älteste Erzählung vom Sinaibund," *ZAW* 73 (1961) 137-46 = *KlSchr,* IV (1968), 12-20; idem, "Sinai-Erzählung und Bileam-Sprüche," *HUCA,* 32 (1961), 179-190 = *KlSchr,* IV (1968), 21-31; idem, "Das Gesetz ist zwischeneingekommen: Ein Beitrag zur Analyse der Sinai-Erzählung, Ex 19–34," *TLZ* 91 (1966) 1-6 = *KlSchr,* IV (1968), 209-14; idem, "Die Komposition der Sinai-Erzählung Ex. 19–34," *SSAW* 113/1 (1966) 5-31 = *FuF* 40 (1966) 213-15 = *KlSchr,* IV (1968), 231-37; K. Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung," *ZTK* 49 (1952) 121-43 = *Kleine Schriften zum AT. ThB* 32 (1966), 174-98; V. Fritz, *Tempel und Zelt: Studien zum Tempelbau in Israel und zu dem Zeltheiligtum der Priesterschrift. WMANT* 47 (1977); J. Gabriel, "Wo lag der biblische Sinai?" *WZKM* 39 (1932) 123-32; H. Gese, "Bemerkungen zur Sinaitradition," *ZAW* 79 (1967) 137-54; idem, "Tò δὲ Ἁγὰρ Σινὰ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ (Gal 4,25)," *Das ferne und nahe Wort. FS L. Rost. BZAW* 105 (1967), 81-94 = *Vom Sinai zum Zion. BEvT* 64 (1974), 49-62; M. Görg, *Das Zelt der Begegnung: Untersuchung zur Gestalt der sakralen Zelttraditionen Altisraels. BBB* 27 (1967); H. Graetz, "Die Lage des Sinai oder Horeb," *MGWJ* 27 (1878) 337-60; J. Gray, "The Desert Sojourn of the Hebrews and the Sinai-Horeb Tradition," *VT* 4 (1954) 148-54; H. Haag, "Das 'Buch des Bundes' (Ex 24,7)," *Wort Gottes in der Zeit. FS K. H. Schelkle* (Düsseldorf, 1973), 22-30; M. Haelvoet, "La Théophanie du Sinaï," *ETL* 29 (1953) 374-97; J. Halbe, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes: Ex 34,10-26. FRLANT* 114 (1975); P. Haupt, "Midian und Sinai," *ZDMG* 63 (1909) 506-30; G. Hölscher, "Sinai und Choreb," *FS R. Bultmann* (Stuttgart/Cologne, 1949), 127-32; F. L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog. OBO* 45 (1982); H. B. Huffmon, "The Exodus, Sinai and the Credo," *CBQ* 27 (1965) 101-13; J. P. Hyatt, "Were There an Ancient Historical Credo in Israel and an Independent Sinai Tradition?" *Translating and Understanding the OT. FS H. G. May* (Nashville, 1970), 152-70; J. Jeremias, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung. WMANT* 10 (²1977); E. C. Kingsbury, "The Theophany *Topos* and the Mountain of God," *JBL* 86 (1967) 205-10; K. Koch, "Die Eigenart der priesterschriftlichen Sinaigesetzgebung," *ZTK* 55 (1958) 36-51; idem, *Die Priesterschrift von Exodus 25 bis Leviticus 16. FRLANT* 71, N.S. 53

I. Occurrences.

1. *Sinai.* Although as a free morpheme the name *sînay* occurs only 5 times in the Hebrew Bible (Ex. 16:1; Dt. 33:2; Jgs. 5:5; Ps. 68:9,18[Eng. vv. 8,17]; Greek also in

---

(1959); J. Koenig, "La localisation du Sinaï et les traditions des scribes," *RHPR* 43 (1963) 2-31; 44 (1964) 200-235; idem, "Itinéraires sinaïtiques en Arabie," *RHR* 166 (1964) 121-41; idem, "Le Sinaï montagne de feu dans un désert de ténèbres," *RHR* 167 (1965) 129-55; idem, "Le problème de la localisation du Sinaï," *Acta Orientalia Belgica: Correspondance d'Orient* 10 (1966) 113-23; idem, "Aux origines des théophanies jahvistes," *RHR* 169 (1966) 1-36; idem, *Le site de Al-Jaw dans l'ancien Pays de Madian* (Paris, 1971); E. Kramer, "Die Wanderung durch den Sinai als Weg durch eine vulkanische Landschaft — Biblische Texte in der Sicht des Mineralogen," *Dielheimer Blätter zum AT* 20 (1984) 159-68; E. Lohse, "Σινᾶ," *TDNT,* VII, 282-87; P. Maiberger, *Topographische und historische Untersuchungen zum Sinaiproblem.* OBO 54 (1984); B. Moritz, "Der Sinaikult in heidnischer Zeit," *Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Phil. Hist.,* N.S., 16/2 (1916), 1-64; M. L. Newman Jr., *The Sinai Covenant Traditions in the Cult of Israel* (New York, 1960); E. W. Nicholson, *Exodus and Sinai in History and Tradition* (Oxford, 1973); D. Nielsen, "The Site of the Biblical Mount Sinai," *JPOS* 7 (1927) 187-208; M. Noth, "Der Wallfahrtsweg zum Sinai (4. Mose 33)," *PJ* 36 (1940) 5-28; idem, *The History of Israel* (Eng. trans., New York, 1958; [2]1960), 127-38; E. Oberhummer, "Die Sinaifrage," *Mitteilungen der k. k. geographischen Gesellschaft* 54 (Vienna, 1911), 628-41; L. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im AT. WMANT* 36 (1969); idem, "Sinai und Horeb," *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. FS W. Zimmerli* (Göttingen, 1977), 302-22; W. J. Phythian-Adams, "The Mount of God," *PEQFS* 62 (1930) 135-49; 192-209; idem, "The Volcanic Phenomena of the Exodus," *JPOS* 12 (1932) 86-103; J. Pirenne, "Le site préislamique de al-Jaw, la Bible, le Coran et le Midrash," *RB* 82 (1975) 34-69; G. von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Eng. trans., New York, 1966), 1-78; idem, *OT Theology,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans., New York, 1962-65), I, 187-279; A. Reichert, "Der Jehowist und die sogenannten deuteronomistischen Erweiterungen im Buch Exodus" (diss., Tübingen, 1972); R. Rendtorff, *Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift: Eine gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. FRLANT* 62, N.S. 44 (1954); H. Graf Reventlow, *Das Heiligkeitsgesetz formgeschichtlich untersucht. WMANT* 6 (1961); L. Rost, "Sinaibund und Davidsbund," *TLZ* 72 (1947) 129-34; W. Rudolph, *Der Aufbau von Exodus 19–34. BZAW* 66 (1936), 41-48; H. H. Schmid, *Der sogennante Jahwist: Beobachtungen und Fragen zur Pentateuchforschung* (Zurich, 1976); J. M. Schmidt, "Erwägungen zum Verhältnis von Auszugs- und Sinaitradition," *ZAW* 82 (1970) 1-31; W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus, Sinai und Mose. EdF* 191 (1983); H. Seebass, *Mose und Aaron, Sinai und Gottesberg. Abhandlungen zur Evangelischen Theologie* 2 (1962); R. Smend, *Yahweh War and Tribal Confederation* (Eng. trans., Nashville, 1970); R. L. Smith, "Covenant and Law in Exodus," *SWJT* 20 (1977) 33-41; J. J. Stamm, "Elia am Horeb," *Studia Biblica et Semitica. FS T. C. Vriezen* (Wageningen, 1966), 327-34; J. A. Thompson, "The Cultic Credo and the Sinai Tradition," *RTR* 27 (1968) 53-64; K.-H. Walkenhorst, *Der Sinai im liturgischen Verständnis der deuteronomistischen und priesterlichen Tradition. BBB* 33 (1969); E. Zenger, *Die Sinaitheophanie. Untersuchungen zum jahwistischen und elohistischen Geschichtswerk. FzB* 3 (1971); idem, *Israel am Sinai: Analysen und Interpretationen zu Exodus 17–34* (Altenberge, 1982); idem, "Psalm 87,6 und die Tafeln vom Sinai," *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch. FS J. Ziegler. FzB* 1-2, ed. J. Schreiner (Würzburg/Stuttgart, 1972), II, *Psalmen und Propheten,* 97-103; W. Zimmerli, "Sinaibund und Abrahambund," *TZ* 16 (1960) 268-80 = *Gottes Offenbarung. ThB* 19 (1963), 205-16; idem, "Erwägungen zum 'Bund.' Die Aussagen über die Jahwe-ברית in Ex 19–34," *Wort, Gebot, Glaube. FS W. Eichrodt. ATANT* 59 (1970), 171-90; B. Zuber, *Vier Studien zu den Ursprüngen Israels: Die Sinaifrage und Probleme der Volks- und Traditionsbildung. OBO* 9 (1976).

Sir. 48:7), it occurs more frequently in the determinative compound *har sînay,* "Mt. Sinai": 16 times, though only (excepting Neh. 9:13) in the Tetrateuch (Ex. 19:11, 18,20,23; 24:16; 31:18; 34:2,4,29,32; Lev. 7:38; 25:1; 26:46; 27:34; Nu. 3:1; 28:6). In place of this, the simple expression *hāhār,* "the mountain," occurs twice as frequently (Ex. 3:12; 19 [12 times]; 20:18; 24 [7 times]; 25:40; 26:30; 27:8; 32:1,15,19; 34:2,3ab, 29). In addition, the name also occurs (only) in Exodus–Numbers in the appositional compound *miḏbar sînay,* "desert of Sinai" (Ex. 19:1,2; Lev. 7:38; Nu. 1:1,19; 3:4,14; 9:1,5; 10:12; 26:64; 33:15,16).

The Targs., like Hebrew, write the name with *yodh* at the end, which Onkelos (and the Syr.) vocalize as the diphthong *ai,* while the LXX transcribes it with a final vowel as *Sina.* It also occurs 4 times in the NT with this monophthong (Acts 7:30,38; Gal. 4:24,25; similarly also in Philo *Her.* 51 §251). But Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion reflect Masoretic pronunciation already in the 2nd century by using the more correct form *Sinai.* The Greek forms used by Josephus already in the 1st century, Σίναιον (*Sínaion, Ap.* 2.2 §25) or Σιναῖον (*Sinaíon, Ap.* 2.37 §264), also point to this pronunciation.

2. *Horeb.* In contrast, the book of Deuteronomy refers to Sinai exclusively as *ḥōrēḇ,* "Horeb" (1:2,6,19; 4:10,15; 5:2; 9:8; 18:16; 28:69[29:1]). This later replacement name also appears in Ex. 3:1; 17:6; 1 K. 8:9 = 2 Ch. 5:10; 1 K. 19:8; Ps. 106:19; Mal. 3:22(4:4) (Sir. 48:7, *chōrēb*). In one instance (Ex. 33:6) the reference is to *har ḥōrēḇ,* "Mt. Horeb." As is the case with *sînay* in the Tetrateuch, so also is *ḥōrēḇ* often replaced by *hāhār,* "the mountain," in Deuteronomy (1:6; 4:11ab; 5:4,5,22,23; 9:9ab,10,15aα-β,21; 10:1,3,4,5,10; 1 K. 19:11).

3. *Mount of God.* The designation *har hā'ᵉlōhîm,* "mount of God" (cf. in contrast the sacred "mount of the gods," *har 'ᵉlōhîm* [without the article] in Ps. 68:16[15]; Ezk. 28:16[+14]) is used in Ex. 3:1; 4:27; 18:5; 24:13; 1 K. 19:8. The use of *har YHWH,* "mount of Yahweh," in reference to Sinai in Nu. 10:33 is unique, since this expression otherwise refers only to Mt. Zion (Ps. 24:3; Isa. 2:3; 30:29; Mic. 4:2; Zec. 8:3).

II. Etymological Derivation. The etymology of *sînay* is as obscure as its exact geographical location. Scholars are not even sure whether it represents a Hebrew or even a Semitic name (*nomen proprium* or *appellativum*?). Derivation from Hebrew is problematical insofar as one cannot determine which *yodh* belongs to the postulated triliteral basis. The *yodh* in the second position can be a radical or represent full *(plene)* writing; the *yodh* in fourth position can be a radical or an afformative. One possible root, *syn* (or *swn*) or **sny* > *snh,* however, is not attested in Hebrew. Comparable derivatives would be Syr. *sînā,* "moon"; Aram. *sᵉyān,* Syr. *sᵉyānā,* "mud, slime, loam"; Aram. and Syr. *sanyā',* Heb. *sᵉneh,* "thornbush"; Arab. *sanā,* "senna"; *sanā,* "glisten, radiate, shine"; *sanā',* "glitter, radiance, shine"; *sanīy,* "high, splendid, majestic"; *sīnā,* "stone." The numerous etymological explanations reflect this variety.

J. Fürst claimed to ascertain the designation "rocky, craggy, jagged mountain," from the root *swn* II, a root related to *syn* but similarly unusual within the OT, which he pos-

its with the meaning "be jagged, pointed, peaked."[1] A. Freiherr von Gall also advocated the meaning "the jagged mountain" with reference to the combination *Siná óros* with *Hagár* in Gal. 4:25, which allegedly could be associated with Arab. *ḥağar,* "stone."[2]

Many scholars today consider the most plausible thesis to be that of F. Baethgen, according to which Mt. Sinai derives its name from the moon god Sin.[3]

R. Lepsius derived it from the wilderness of Sin (which others similarly associated with the moon god), explaining it as the Nisbeform *Sînî,* i.e., "the mount of *Sîn.*"[4]

The secondary association of thornbush and the divine mountain Horeb in Ex. 3:1 supported the etymological association of *sînay* and *s^eneh,* which plays an important role in tradition and is occasionally still advocated today.[5] It occurs already among early Jewish exegetes.[6] According to R. Eleazar Modi'in (died ca. 135), the mountain was originally called Horeb; after God revealed himself to Moses in the *s^eneh,* however, it was called *sînay.* This etymology, also advocated by Jerome, predominated into the 18th century. For E. Auerbach, too, *sînay* cannot be separated from *s^eneh,* so that it means virtually "mountain of the thornbush" or "the thorn mount, the pointed mountain," etymologically related to the rocky crag *(šēn hassela')* in 1 S. 14:4, to be translated as *senneh,* "thorn rock."[7] According to P. Haupt, Sinai means approximately "Senna mountain," because many senna plants grew in abundance there (Arab. *sanā'u, sanā,* or *Cassia angustifolia,* in his opinion the *s^eneh* of Ex. 3).[8]

Since it cannot be determined with which mountain Sinai is to be identified, however, these explanations can be verified neither according to concrete topographical considerations nor philologically.

An etymological allusion also occurs in Gal. 4:25, where Paul uses *tó dé Hagár Siná óros estín en tę̄ Arabía* to establish the connection between Hagar and Sinai, two terms not naturally associated with one another (the *tertium comparationis* of this allegory is slavery), referring to the identity between the name or word *(tó!)* Hagar and Mt. Sinai: "namely, because Hagar means Sina(i)." As a matter of fact, Arabic dictionaries do attest a word *sīnā* with the meaning "stone" = *ḥağar!*[9] Paul is apparently alluding to this Arabic equivalence *Sīnā* = *ḥağar* ("stone") in order to establish a connection

---

1. *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT* (Leipzig, [2]1863), II, 74, 79 (cf. also *A Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the OT* [Eng. trans. [4]1871]). Cf. his *Concordantiae Hebraicae Librorum sacrorum Veteris Testamenti* (Leipzig, 1840), 1285.

2. *Altisraelitische Kultstätten. BZAW* 3 (1898), 16.

3. *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1888), 106. Cf. *GesB* and *BL* ([2]1968), 1594.

4. *Reise von Theben nach der Halbinsel des Sinaï* (Berlin, 1846), 46.

5. Cf. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 39f.; W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus. BK* II/2 (1977), 116; also *KBL*[2], 656.

6. Cf. St.-B, III, 572, which lists additional folk etymological interpretations of the name Sinai.

7. *Moses* (Eng. trans., Detroit, 1975), 149.

8. "Midian und Sinai," 509; and "The Burning Bush and the Origin of Judaism," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 48 (Philadelphia, 1909) 364.

9. Cf. also Lane, I/4, 1487: *sīnā'u,* "certain stones."

through popular etymology between Mt. *Sina* (homophonic in the LXX), which he thus probably understood as "rocky mountain," and Hagar.

III. Oldest Understanding.

1. *Theological Considerations.* The oldest understanding of Sinai is found in the poetic writings Dt. 33:2; Jgs. 5:4f.; and Ps. 68:8f(7f.). Here Sinai functions not as the goal of the wilderness wanderings and the locus of revelation, covenant, and the giving of the law, but rather merely as Yahweh's dwelling place. It is not Israel that comes to Sinai, but rather quite the contrary, according to the prologue of Moses' blessing: Yahweh (emphasized by its prior positioning) "comes *(bā')* from *(min)*" Sinai to Israel. The framing text Dt. 33:2-5 and 26-29, which resembles a psalm, contains an older, formerly independent tradition into which the actual corpus of tribal sayings (vv. 6-25) were then inserted;[10] thus according to the original context, Yahweh, the God of Jeshurun, comes from Sinai in order to aid his people by destroying its enemies (vv. 26f.; cf. Ps. 18 = 2 S. 22; Isa. 59:20; Hos. 10:12; Hab. 3:3). The theophany takes place amid brilliance (*zāraḥ;* cf. Isa. 60:1f.) and radiance (*hôpîa';* cf. Job 10:3; Ps. 50:2; 80:2[1]; 94:1; cf. also Hab. 3:3f.,11; might this suggest an etymological connection between *sînay* and the Arabic root *sny,* "glisten, radiate, shine"?). Jgs. 5:4 and Ps. 68:8(7) also portray Yahweh's coming as a mobilization against the enemy (*yāṣā'* in the military sense with Yahweh as subject: Ex. 11:4; Jgs. 4:14; 2 S. 5:24 = 1 Ch. 14:15; Ps. 44:10[9]; 60:12[10]; 108:12[11]; Hab. 3:13; *ṣā'aḏ* par. *yāṣā'* also in 2 S. 5:24 = 1 Ch. 14:15; cf. also Mic. 1:3). Here, however, the theophany is accompanied by earthquakes (*rā'aš;* cf. 2 S. 22:8 = Ps. 18:8[7]; Ps. 77:19[18]; Isa. 24:18f.), the trembling of mountains (*zālal* niphal; cf. Isa. 63:19[64:1]; 64:2[3]; further Hab. 3:6,10), and cloudbursts (*nāṭap* only here; cf. Ps. 77:18[17]; Hab. 3:10).

2. *Idiomatic Considerations (zeh sînay).* Since according to Dt. 33:2 Yahweh comes out of Seir from Sinai, and also according to Jgs. 5:4 goes forth from Seir, many scholars explain the expression *zeh sînay* in v. 5c as an epithet of Yahweh. Standing immediately next to "Yahweh" (in Ps. 68:9[8] next to "Elohim"), it is usually viewed as a gloss; because it parallels the epithet "God of Israel" (v. 5e), however, A. Globe refers to metrical considerations to support his view that it constitutes part of the original text.[11] After H. Grimme referred to the comparable name of the Nabatean deity *ḏû-šarâ* (Dushara, Dusares), W. F. Albright and others also explained *zeh sînay* after the model of the Arabic construction with *ḏû* as "he [i.e., the master, owner, proprietor] of Sinai" (cf. Vulg. Ps. 67/68:9, *Dei Sinai*).[12] Although H. Birkeland objected that this

---

10. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 204f. According to I. L. Seeligmann, "A Psalm from Pre-Regal Times," *VT* 14 (1964) 90f., this tradition did not use any specific Sinai narrative as its source.

11. "The Text and Literary Structure of Judges 5,4-5," *Bibl* 55 (1974) 171.

12. Grimme, "Abriss der biblisch-hebräischen Metrik," *ZDMG* 50 (1896) 573; Albright, "The Names *Shaddai* and *Abram,*" *JBL* 54 (1935) 204; idem, "The Song of Deborah in the Light of Archaeology," *BASOR* 62 (1936) 30; idem, "A Catalogue of Early Hebrew Lyric

particular function of the demonstrative pronoun is specifically Arabic, and does not extend to Hebrew (cf., however, *zeh šālôm,* Mic. 5:4[5]), J. Jeremias refutes this with reference to Ugaritic parallels in which *d* is used quite similarly.[13] Comparable names include Akk. *šu-sin,* "he of Sin," and *zu-ḫatni(m)* in Mari. Accordingly, É. Lipiński, drawing on the analogy with the South Arabic divine name combined with the demonstrative *ḏ-/ḏt-,* considers *zeh sînay* to be an archaic name construction.[14] In any case, the translation postulated by grammatical considerations, "that is Sinai" (LXX *toúto Sina),* possesses no syntagmatic relationship as a gloss, since Yahweh (or Elohim) cannot be considered as a reference word, and only in Jgs. 5:5 can it cogently refer to the preceding (pl.!) *hārîm,* "mountains" (Vulg. *Montes fluxerunt . . . et Sinai;* although, as A. B. Ehrlich suggests, *zeh* refers forward and not, like *hû',* backward;[15] cf. Jgs. 7:4b and 7:1, etc.), but not in Ps. 68:9(8), since it does not occur there (cf. Jgs. 5:5 with Ps. 68:9[8]).

Ps. 68:8f.(7f.) obviously depends on Jgs. 5:4f. (according to Jeremias, both are based on the same oral tradition).[16] The indication of place *miśśē'îr* (cf. Dt. 33:2) was replaced by *lipnê 'ammeḵā* (a prepositional phrase occurring otherwise only in connection with Yahweh war in Jgs. 4:14; 2 S. 5:24 = 1 Ch. 14:15), and *miśśᵉḏēh 'ᵉḏôm* by *bîšîmôn* (which circumscribes the desert situation in Dt. 32:10; Ps. 78:40; 106:14; 107:4), whereby Yahweh's mighty, delivering assistance was reinterpreted as protection during the wilderness wanderings. Vv. 4b and 5aα were eliminated (as a doubling of v. 4aγ), particularly since they are appropriate only as circumstances accompanying a theophany, and "Elohim" replaced "Yahweh," so that the threefold mention of Elohim in v. 9(8) — contra H.-J. Kraus — is not to be taken as excess.

Following Dt. 33:2, *BHS* emends the unclear passage Ps. 68:18b(17b), *'ᵃḏōnāy "ḇām sînay" baqqōḏeš* (similarly LXX, *ho kýrios "en autoís en Sina" en tǭ hagíǭ*), with the conj. *bā' missînay,* "the Lord came from Sinai into the holy place."[17] According to this understanding, during the early monarchy Sinai was still considered to be Yahweh's dwelling place, since Kraus regards the life setting of Ps. 68 to have

---

Poems (Psalm LXVIII)," *HUCA* 23/1 (1950/51) 20; H. S. Nyberg, *Hebreisk grammatik* (Uppsala, 1952), §84j n. 2; J. M. Allegro, "Uses of the Semitic Demonstrative Element *z* in Hebrew," *VT* 5 (1955) 311; C. Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax* (Neukirchen, 1956), §75; J. Jeremias, *Theophanie,* 8f., 105.

13. Birkeland, "Hebrew *zæ* and Arabic *ḏū*," *ST* 2 (1949) 201f. Objections are also raised by W. Richter, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch. BBB* 18 (1963), 69 n. 35; and H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1989), 46. Cf. Jeremias, 9; similarly M. Dahood, *Psalms 51–100. AB* 17 (1968), 139. See *UT,* §§13, 75.

14. Lipiński, "Juges 5,4-5 et Psaume 68,8-11," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 198f. Cf. A. Jamme, "Le panthéon sud-arabe préislamique d'après les sources épigraphiques," *Mus* 60 (1947) 64f.; and M. Höfner, "Orts- und Götternamen in Südarabien," *FS H. von Wissmann* (Tübingen, 1962), 181-85.

15. *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel,* 7 vols. (1908-14; repr. Hildesheim, 1968), III, 82.

16. Pp. 10f.

17. Cf. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* in loc. M. Dahood, *Psalms 51–100,* 131, 143, reads *'ᵃḏōn yāḇam,* "who created Sinai as his sanctuary."

been a "festival of the epiphany" of the God of Sinai on Mt. Tabor during the time of Saul.[18]

The meaning of this Sinai tradition, the oldest actually attested in literature and one that according to J. M. Schmidt was strongly influenced by cultically based traditions, was obviously restricted both geographically (northern kingdom?) and according to genre (theophany).[19] The original focus was probably only the particular understanding of God entertained by a single proto-Israelite group (one related to the Shasu Bedouin of Seir mentioned in Egyptian texts?),[20] namely, veneration of the Yahweh who dwelled on Sinai and went forth from there to aid his people; this veneration was gradually expanded to include all Israel, and began to play an increasingly significant role only through its association with the exodus events and the figure of Moses identified with those events.

3. *Geographical Considerations.* According to Dt. 33:2 and Jgs. 5:4, Sinai is situated in Seir. Although the context does not specify whether this freestanding morpheme "Sinai" (also Ex. 16:1; Ps. 68:9[8]) refers to a mountain, a mountain chain, or a region in the mountainous area of Seir, later tradition as well as analogous notions of mountains associated with deities suggests that the reference is probably to a specific, individual mountain. The parallelism between Seir and the mountain/mountain chain Paran in Dt. 33:2 (which according to M. Noth "is almost certainly identical with the modern *jebel fārān* on the western side of the *wādi el-ʿaraba*")[21] seems to point in the direction of the extended surroundings of Kadesh, since according to Nu. 13:36 (cf. 13:3) this locale is situated in the wilderness of Paran, presumably named after the mountain chain (Gen. 21:21; Nu. 10:12; 12:16; 1 S. 25:1; cf. also Gen. 14:6, "from Mount [or the mountain chain] Seir as far as El-paran on the border of the wilderness").

This would support the conj. Meribath-Kadesh in Dt. 33:2 instead of MT *mērib̲ᵉb̲ōt̲ qōd̲eš* (LXX *sýn myriásin Kades*), though this place reference otherwise occurs only in connection with *mê,* water" (Nu. 27:14; Dt. 32:51; Ezk. 48:28; conj. 47:19).[22] B. Margulis also reads Kadesh instead of *qōd̲eš* in Ps. 68:18(17): "The Lord comes from Sinai, God from Qadesh."[23] In Jgs. 5:4, Seir stands parallel to Edom (similarly also Nu. 24:18; Isa. 21:11; Ezk. 35:15). According to Gen. 32:4(3), Esau lived in Seir, in the country of Edom (cf. Gen. 36:8f.; Dt. 2:12,22,29). According to Hab. 3:3, God comes from the mountain range of Paran and from the region of Teman, a region otherwise mentioned in connection with Edom (Isa. 49:7,20; Ezk. 25:13; Am. 1:12), since

18. *Psalms 60–150,* 50.

19. P. 22.

20. Cf. R. Giveon, *Les bédouins Shosou des documents égyptiens. DMOA* 22 (1971), documents 6a and 16a, and pp. 267-71.

21. *History of Israel,* 132.

22. So *BHS* and G. von Rad, *Das fünfte Buch Mose (Deuteronomium). ATD* VIII (⁴1984), 144. (The Eng. trans., *Deuteronomy. OTL* [1966], 202, uses the RSV: "from the ten thousands of holy ones.")

23. "תהלים סח;יח־יט ומסורת מרי בני־אל. Ps 68:18 and the Tradition of Divine Rebellion," *Tarbiz* 39 (1969/70) 1-8.

Teman was a grandson of Esau (Gen. 36:11,15,42; Ob. 9), who was also called Edom (Gen. 36:1).

Even if Seir and Edom are situated on either side of the Arabah, the parallelism between Seir and Paran nonetheless suggests that Sinai (and thus the home of Yahweh) is to be sought southwest of the Dead Sea in the extended region (probably to the east) of Kadesh.

IV. Literary-Critical and Traditio-Historical Problems. In contrast to the older, archaic understanding, according to which Yahweh "comes from" his dwelling place "Sinai" to aid his people, the classic Sinai model always speaks of "Mt. Sinai," "onto" which Yahweh "descends" from heaven under the veil of natural forces as *mysterium tremendum,* speaking then to Moses, the charismatic leader and mediator who alone is permitted to approach God, while the people remain at a reverential distance at the foot of the mountain. In the course of time, this core, especially Yahweh's own words and his relationship to the Israelites, was augmented by various sources of tradition, legal collections, and commentaries; the result of this gradual process of growth, a process involving the insertion and shifting of these different texts by redactors, is the complex and huge Sinai pericope now extending from Ex. 19 to Nu. 10. The subsequent referral of almost all legal and cultic statutes back to Sinai resulted in the construction of a marvelous theological didactic edifice that long ago lost any basis in historical or topographical recollections. Sinai increasingly became an ideal mountain transcending all earthly regions, one in which Israel honored the "summit" of its life institutions and wisdom.

Despite considerable effort and patience, literary and tradition criticism have been unable to disentangle completely the snarl of transmitted traditions bound up with the topos "Sinai," "an apparently hopeless jumble."[24] Although essential structures of individual sources and redactional strata (such as various notions of theophany; the covenant procedure; relationships between Yahweh, Moses, and the people; models for the tablets; and legal corpora) have been more or less clearly delineated, the source classification of many passages (including, of course, the views presented here) is still disputed,[25] and many questions remain open.

Primary among these is the question whether the Sinai tradition and the exodus events were originally separate complexes of traditions, each with its own distinct setting in life (cult) (since, e.g., Josh. 24:2-13 mentions the exodus, the wilderness wanderings, and the land conquest, but not the events at Sinai [cf. also Dt. 26:5-9; Ps. 78; 105; 135; 136; and since the insertion of the Sinai pericope sundered the Kadesh narratives in Ex. 17–18 and Nu. 10–14).[26] If this is the case, then when and where was the exodus tradition combined with the (older or younger)[27] Sinai tradition, i.e., how did

---

24. H. Gressmann, *Mose und seine Zeit. FRLANT,* N.S. 1 (1913), 181.

25. In the case of Ex. 19:23f.,32-24, this can be seen clearly in the table presented by Zenger, *Sinaitheophanie,* 206-31.

26. According to von Rad, "Form-Critical Problem," 13ff.

27. Older according to M. Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Eng. trans., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972), 61; and Gese, *ZAW* 79 (1967) 139ff.; younger according to Smend, 84f.

Moses and "Israel" come to be at Sinai? The earliest literary stratum in which this is discernible is the Yahwist, who according to G. von Rad was the first to combine together the exodus and Sinai; in contrast, M. Noth thinks this was already the case in the (disclosed) basic source (G: *Grundschrift*) the Yahwist had before him.[28] While E. Zenger suspects the factor precipitating this connection is the process of tribal development commencing after the land conquest, W. Beyerlin and J. M. Schmidt believe it took place already in Kadesh, the gathering point of the Sinai and exodus group.[29]

Although the Sinai tradition plays a special role in J and E, not a single allusion either to Sinai or to the Sinai tradition — either explicit or implicit — is made in the entire preexilic prophetic canon, a most peculiar situation. Yahweh's claim to Israel is never justified through reference to the revelation at Sinai, nor is the people's sin ever reproached as transgression against his legal will as proclaimed at Sinai. Von Rad explains this strange "Sinai silence" by suggesting that "the fusion of the Sinai tradition with the Settlement tradition" was for a long time not "fully accepted," and acquired "popular approval" only during the exilic period.[30] In contrast, H. H. Schmid attempts to explain this lacuna in tradition through a reference to the later commencement of J himself (in the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic period).[31]

Taking as his point of departure the "cult legend" of a prestate (amphictyonic) covenantal celebration in Shechem, von Rad already identified in the Yahwistic Sinai pericope, albeit in austere form, all the essential elements of theophany, covenant, proclamation of the commandments, Decalog, and tablets[32] (elements that according to Beyerlin are rooted in Kadesh);[33] the essentials of these elements allegedly were maintained in their basic conception through the final redaction, and were merely amplified further. New studies, however, show that despite various deviations relating to details, the basis of the Yahwistic portrayal is actually much slimmer.[34]

V. The Sinai Event in the Pentateuch Sources.

1. *Yahwist.* According to Zenger, the Yahwistic Sinai story is divided into three acts with variously changing scenery.[35] The first act (mountain summit) portrays Yahweh's descent onto Sinai before the encamped people. The second (beneath the mountain) recounts the sacrifices for Yahweh. The third (mountain summit) recounts Yahweh's solemn promise to the people.

Yahweh, who dwells in heaven, must (as elsewhere in J) "come down" (*yāraḏ,* Ex.

---

28. Von Rad, "Form-Critical Problem," 53ff.; Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions,* 40f.

29. Zenger, *Israel am Sinai,* 125; Beyerlin, 165ff.; Schmidt, 23.

30. "Form-Critical Problem," 54.

31. P. 157.

32. "Form-Critical Problem," 15ff.; and following him also Noth, *History of Pentateuchal Traditions,* 31; idem, *The History of Israel* (Eng. trans., New York, ²1960), 127ff.

33. Pp. 165-71.

34. Perlitt, Zenger, Reichert.

35. *Israel am Sinai,* 156f.

19:20a; cf. Ex. 34:5; Mic. 1:3) to earth (Gen. 11:5,7), to the summit of Sinai, whereby the "whole" *(kullô)* mountain smokes, i.e., is enveloped in smoke, and its smoke goes up "like the smoke of a kiln" (Ex. 19:18aα-bα; "fire" in v. 18aβ is an addendum from JE). Although the rising smoke (which does not, however, envelop the whole mountain) does recall volcanic activity, it does not prove that Sinai was a volcano,[36] especially since other volcanic phenomena are completely absent in J; rather, its purpose (similar to that of the pillar of cloud in Ex. 14:20 J or the smoke-filled temple in Isa. 6:4; cf. also Gen. 15:17; 2 S. 22:9 par. Ps. 18:9[8]; 104:32; 144:5) is merely to signal Yahweh's presence; the comparison with the smelting oven indicates that Israel is purified at Sinai (cf. Ps. 17:3; 66:10; Isa. 1:25; 48:10).

In the conception of J, Israel's institution of worship is established at Sinai. The theophany is followed by the construction of the altar (as in Gen. 12:7!), as well as by burnt and animal offerings (Ex. 24:4aβ,b,5 [and 6?]), the sacrificial celebration in the wilderness, which runs like a red thread through the Yahwistic exodus narrative (3:18; 5:3,8,17; 7:16,26[8:1]; 8:4,16,24[8,20,28]; 9:1,13; 10:3; 12:31). "Israel" sets out for Sinai, for the source of its Yahweh faith, in order to worship "its" God there. To be sure, according to J, Yahweh is no longer bound to Sinai itself; rather, this "mountain" is merely a venerable holy place upon which he descends and where, as it were, he "passes by" (Ex. 34:6) and reveals himself to Moses as the representative of the people (cf. 1 K. 19:11f.). In a dialogue with Moses, Yahweh pledges himself to perform marvels before the people (Ex. 34:10; the absolute use of *kāraṯ beriṯ*, without preposition, in the presentative in reference to an individual, future action, continued with *x-yiqṭōl*, refers to a one-sided self-obligation).

The descent of Yahweh to a specific mountain, where at the same time he withdraws from the vision of human beings, the altar construction with the sacrificial celebration, and Yahweh's special attention to his people at this place all point probably to Zion, which appropriated the role of the old Sinai (which is why a later "pilgrimage" to Sinai, as postulated by Noth, was superfluous).[37]

2. *Elohist.* According to Zenger, the Elohistic Sinai theophany in Ex. 19 is discernible only in a fragmentary form due to the fusion of J and E to JE (which occurred after the demise of the northern kingdom in 722 B.C.).[38] The Sinai event itself, however, while maintaining the same basic narrative form, did undergo a significant theological deepening. E divided his divine epiphany into three scenes: preparation (Ex. 19:2f.,10f.,14f.), theophany signs (19:16-18), and theophany (19:19; 20:20), and oriented it more closely to the people itself, structuring it after the model of a festival assembly (behind which, on the basis of common features with Hos. 6:2 and Am. 4:4,12, various scholars suspect a three-day covenantal festival in the northern

36. According to M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 156, 159f.; Jeremias, 104, 207; and J. M. Schmidt, 16, the accompanying circumstances of the theophany in J, D, and P are of a volcanic nature.

37. "Der Wallfahrtsweg zum Sinai," 8.

38. *Israel am Sinai,* 130-38, 179-85.

kingdom).[39] E speaks in a generalizing fashion about the "mountain" on which "the God" *(hā'ᵉlōhîm)* is present (permanently or at a given point?); Moses climbs up to God and is addressed from the mountain (19:3a-bα). The theophany itself (19:16), occurring on the morning of the third day after the consecration of the people, is accompanied by a violent storm with all its attendant features; this thunder, lightning, and thick cloud *('ānān)* "upon the mountain" *('al-hāhār)* represent a traditional trio borrowed from the Canaanite sphere, one signaling especially the coming of Ba'al, who lives in his royal palace on a sacred mountain,[40] while the loud blast of the ram's horn recalls a cultic celebration (cf. Lev. 25:9; Ps. 81:4[3]; Isa. 27:13; Joel 2:15). Moses leads the people, who are seized by divine terror, out of the camp (cf. *hôṣî',* Ex. 3:10f., E) to God at the foot (*taḥtîṯ:* late nominal construction?) of the mountain (19:17), where they come to stand, ready for service, as if before a royal throne. While the people (MT "the mountain," *hāhār;* LXX *ho laós;* similarly 9 Heb. mss.) tremble more and more (*ḥāraḏ* is used only of persons, not of an earthquake; cf. 1 S. 14:15), Moses as their representative and mediator speaks with God, who, as Moses relates to the people, has "come" *(bā')* to test them and to encourage in them the fear of God (cf. this characteristic feature for E esp. in Gen. 22), so that they do not sin (20:20).

3. *JE.* According to Zenger, the JE historical work introduced a fundamentally new element into previous Sinai theology: proclamation of the law.[41] To the promise culminating in the Yahwistic Sinai pericope in Ex. 34:10a, JE appended a small legal collection deriving in part from ancient legal traditions of the prestate period (34:11a,12-15a,18-21*,25-27*), known as the "cultic Decalog" or the "JE privilege code" (which, according to L. Perlitt, however, is actually Deuteronomistic).[42] Inspired by the motif "fear of God," one determinative for E, he introduces it with a programmatic prohibition of foreign gods; in view of the bull cult in Bethel that contributed to the demise of the northern kingdom, this prompted the insertion of the story of the golden calf (Ex. 32*), a polemic against false worship of Yahweh.[43] What in J (Ex. 34:10a) is a one-sided self-obligation on Yahweh's part, JE reinterprets into a mutual covenant (34:27) made "by virtue of these words" *('al-pî haddᵉḇārîm hā'ēlleh)* between *(kāraṯ bᵉrîṯ: x-qāṭal* indicating the coincidence or the so-called declarative perfect with the prep. *'eṯ)* Yahweh and Moses ("and with Israel" is syntactically secondary; cf. Jer. 31:31) as the representative of the people. In this covenant relationship conceived after the model of feudal law, Yahweh claims certain feudal obligations from Israel contingent on the

---

39. W. Brueggemann, "Amos IV 4-13 and Israel's Covenant Worship," *VT* 15 (1965) 1-15; J. Wijngaards, "Death and Resurrection in Covenantal Context (Hos. VI 2)," *VT* 17 (1967) 226-39; C. Barth, "Theophanie, Bundschliessung und neuer Anfang zum dritten Tage," *EvT* 28 (1968) 521-33.

40. Jeremias, 199.

41. *Die Sinaitheophanie,* 200, 228-30; *Israel am Sinai,* 186-95.

42. *Bundestheologie im AT,* 228f.

43. Cf. Dohmen, 144f.

promised privilege of the gift of the land. Thus Sinai as the locus of promise (J) became that of Israel's obligation, establishing the connection between history and law, *evangelium* and *lex,* that was to prove so significant for the entire biblical tradition.

Maiberger

The motif of the tablets plays a significant role in the theological conception of the JE Sinai theophany. The oldest evidence of the tablets is found in JE, namely, Ex. 24:12* and 31:18*; removal of later redactional activity reveals that both passages speak of *luḥōṯ 'eḇen.*[44] The term *luḥōṯ 'eḇen* represents a translation of the Assyrian legal term *ṭuppu dannu/dannatu,* which is important especially in view of the absence of any indication of the content of these tablets, since *ṭuppu dannu* refers to a particular form of publication for a legal decree, namely, public announcement. Only this explains the meaning of these tablets "without text" mentioned by JE. By employing this particular juridical terminology, JE is lending expression to the notion that it is Yahweh himself who publicly attests and thus lends binding character to the events at Sinai (theophany and sacrifice).

This conception is significant particularly in view of the introduction of the basic narrative of Ex. 32 and especially also of the privilege code of Ex. 34 by JE; for in the first instance the manifestation of the relationship between Yahweh and the people is an act of Yahweh himself (through the tablets), and in the second an act of the people (through obedience to the commandments). The point of intersection between the two forms is the story in Ex. 32, which makes clear that the people were unable to do justice to Yahweh's offer; they turned away from God, who was himself turning toward them, and instead conducted what amounted to a counterevent to the Sinai theophany. This becomes especially clear in Moses' juridical act of breaking the tablets in Ex. 32:20.

This "counterevent," however, accords completely with JE's conception of the Sinai theophany, since it, too, takes places over three days, corresponding to the explicit three-day Sinai theophany of E (Ex. 19:11,14ff.) and the implict one of J (19:2ff.; 24:4; 34:2,4). Altogether, JE composes here a three-stage drama. JE appropriates: (1) the entire conception of the three days from E along with the first two days from J (the first stage ends with the handing over of the *luḥōṯ 'eḇen* in 31:18); (2) the three-day counterevent in Ex. 32 with the symbolic breaking of the tablets in 32:19; (3) the high point is the bestowal of the privilege code on the third day of J's original Sinai theophany, and the conclusion is then the command to write this (the privilege code) down as a covenantal document (34:27). This creates an enduring relationship in the connection of Sinai and law by JE, the presupposition for the cumulation of legal materials in the Sinai pericope by later redactors.[45]

Dohmen

44. Dohmen, 133f.
45. On this entire complex, cf. Dohmen, 132-41.

4. *Deuteronomist.* Deuteronomic redaction (at the time of Josiah?) reworked the core narrative relating to the commandments in what is known as proto-Deuteronomy (chs. 12–25*) and essentially added the introductory discourses in chs. 5–11*, shifting the making of the covenant and the giving of the law to "Horeb," the exclusive name given to Sinai in the book of Deuteronomy.

a. *Origin and Etymology of Horeb.* The provenance of the designation *ḥōrēḇ* (LXX *Chōrēb*) is not clear. According to Noth, the name in any case does not derive, as earlier consensus believed, from E but rather from an older, no longer extant tradition, a fragment of which might be preserved in the gloss Dt. 1:2.[46] The suggestion that Horeb originally represented a different mountain, one associated with some sort of law proclamation that Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic circles then fused with Sinai, would be plausible only if the Deuteronomist had introduced the idea of a giving of the law, an idea that JE, albeit on a rather spartan foundation, had already associated with the Sinai event.[47] H. Cazelles preferred to trace the two mountain names back to two originally separate "covenantal" traditions. According to Perlitt, however, Horeb does not represent a geographical name primary to the source itself, but rather a substitution introduced by Deuteronomistic circles for the traditional Sinai, a cipher (derived from the root → חרב *ḥārab*, "be dry, dry up"; "lie desolate, be desolate") to be translated as "desert area," one that in view of Sinai's location in Seir (cf. Jgs. 5:4f.) was supposed to purge any association with (at that time) despised Edom (and perhaps also with the moon god Sin), and suggest simply the desert situated south or southeast of Palestine.[48] Older etymologies are based on a different distinction between sources and the resulting geographical and topographical notions.[49]

The designation "Horeb" does not occur prior to Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic literature. It occurs only in the secondary portions of the book of Deuteronomy (1:2,6,19; 4:10,15; 5:2; 9:8; 18:16; 28:69[29:1]) and in texts dependent on these occurrences (1 K. 8:9 par. 2 Ch. 5:10 has been influenced by Dt. 9:7b–10:11; Ps. 106 presupposes the Deuteronomistic theology of history; and Mal. 3:22[4:4] represents a late postexilic admonition cast in Deuteronomic language).

b. *Mount of God.* Because the statement of direction has obviously been repeated (prep. *'el* and *he locale*), some scholars consider the clumsy expression "to [the] Horeb" to be a gloss in the indication of location "to the mount of God and to [the] Horeb" (*'el-har hā'ᵉlōhîm ḥōrēḇâ,* Ex. 3:1).[50] G. Fohrer, W. Richter, and P. Weimar dispute the suggestion that "Horeb" represents a redactional addendum intending to

---

46. *The Deuteronomistic History. JSOTSup* 15 (Eng. trans. 1981), 27f.

47. So Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im AT,* 228f.

48. "Sinai und Horeb," 310-32.

49. E.g., According to Haupt, 509, Horeb = "bare mountain" represents a later name for the deforested crown of the "Sinai volcano"; A. Freiherr von Gall, *Altisraelitische Kultstätten. BZAW* 3 (1898), 19, alleges that Horeb probably means "barrenness, aridity"; for Auerbach, *Moses,* 149, it means "swordrock."

50. Noth, *Deuteronomistic History,* 109 n. 10; idem, *Exodus,* in loc.; Seebass, 5; Perlitt, *Sinai und Horeb,* 309; and W. H. Schmidt, *BK* II/2, 137.

identify more closely the unnamed "mount of God."[51] Weimar considers Ex. 3:1bβ, which Fohrer and Richter ascribe to E, to be a redactional connector from the hand of R^P. In any event, regardless of whether one ascribes this doubling ("to the mount of God, to [the] Horeb") to one or two different redactors, it does support the allegation of a combination of two originally separate entities that in 1 K. 19:8 have been fused into the "Horeb the mount of God," where the indicator of direction (prep. *'aḏ*) is given only once, the result being that Horeb (which for Noth gives the impression of being a Deuteronomistic gloss)[52] becomes an apposition. According to H.-C. Schmitt, the text of the Horeb scene in 1 K. 19, a text whose temporal classification is yet disputed, dates at the earliest from the exilic period.[53] Thus Weimar traces the name "mount of God" back to a contemporary, perhaps even postexilic redactor (not, as is customarily the case, to E) in 1 K. 19:8, as also in Ex. 3:1; 4:27; 18:5; and 24:13), a name representing a theological rather than a geographical designation whose intention is to emphasize the religious significance of the events associated with it, as evident within the framework of the call of Moses.[54]

If, as suggested by the preceding discussion, both "Horeb" and the "mount of God" represent literarily late, fictitious names, and if thus the Yahwistic thornbush scene, which takes place in Midian (Ex. 3*), was only secondarily relocated to the mount of God/Horeb = Sinai, then Sinai, Horeb, and the mount of God cannot, as has occasionally been the case, be viewed as three different, geographically or topographically distinct mountains, and none of them can be located in Midian.

c. *Concerning the Location of Horeb.* It is not clear just what understanding of the geographical location of Horeb the late Deuteronomistic gloss represents: "it is eleven days' journey from Horeb by the way of Mt. Seir to Kadesh-barnea" (Dt. 1:2; cf. in contrast the forty days' journey from the vicinity of Beer-sheba to Horeb in 1 K. 19:8, as well as the distance from Sinai to Kadesh in the itinerary in Nu. 33:16-36). In any event, this information is all but useless in the determination of a location, since the location of Mt. Seir cannot be exactly determined, and because the absence of any additional place indications makes it impossible to determine the course of the route given (leading from Kadesh in the direction of the Seir mountain range to the east). This gloss apparently does not, as does the oldest understanding of Sinai, seek Horeb in the mountain range of Seir itself, but rather at a far distance from it. According to Perlitt, the intention is merely to separate this mountain "by many days' journey" (but why specifically eleven?) from Seir, which was discredited on account of despised Edom.[55] By contrast, H. Gese calculated from the eleven days a distance of 560 km. (348 mi.), arriving at Ḥallat al-Badr in northwestern Arabia, and

---

51. Fohrer, *Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus. BZAW* 91 (1964), 39; Richter, *Die sogenannten vorprophetischen Berufungsberichte. FRLANT* 101 (1970), 103 n. 1; Weimar, *Die Berufung des Mose. OBO* 32 (1980), 32f.; cf. also 368 and 374.

52. *Deuteronomistic History,* 109f. n. 11; and *History of Pentateuchal Traditions,* 60f. n. 186.

53. *Elisa* (Gütersloh, 1972), 126.

54. *Die Berufung des Mose,* 32f., 338f.

55. "Sinai und Horeb," 314.

for Y. Aharoni this route leads into the high mountains of the southern Sinai Peninsula.[56] Those who lived in the age of the Deuteronomist presumably no longer had any geographical knowledge of ancient Sinai, since over the course of time it had become ever more theologized and detached from the real world. In the didactic narrative of the golden calf (not to be taken as an historical event) Moses scatters the powder of the ground-up idol "into the water" and makes the people drink it (Ex. 32:20, Deuteronomistic), whereas in Dt. 9:21 (Deuteronomic) he "throws it into the brook that descended out of the mountain": this probably attests less an exact familiarity with the locale (associated with a concrete mountain that the Deuteronomist considers to be Horeb) than a differing understanding of the symbolism of destruction or of judgment.[57]

Typical features of the Deuteronomistic Horeb theophany include the "mountain burning in fire" (*w^e^hāhār bō'ēr bā'ēš,* Dt. 4:11; 5:23; 9:15), terminologically recalling the "thornbush burning in fire" (*hass^e^neh bō'ēr bā'ēš,* Ex. 3:2, and according to W. H. Schmidt also appropriated thence),[58] and Yahweh's speaking "out of the midst of the fire" (*mittôḵ hā'ēš,* Dt. 4:12,15,33; 5:4,22,26; 9:10; 10:4). Covenant theology moves most prominently and clearly into the foreground among the Deuteronomistic redactors, something already expressed compositionally in the placement of the verses Ex. 19:4-8, reflecting the notion of covenant, before the JE Sinai theophany. Moses functions as the mediator between the two covenant partners Yahweh and Israel (cf. Ex. 24:3) insofar as he speaks of the "covenant that Yahweh has made with you (*'immāḵem*)" (Ex. 24:8; Dt. 4:13,23; 9:9; 31:16; cf. in contrast "with us" in Dt. 5:2f., where Moses stands on the side of the people). In Ex. 19–24 and 32–34 the Deuteronomistic redaction develops its covenant theology in the tripartite making of the covenant (19–24*), breaking of the covenant (32*), and renewal of the covenant through forgiveness (34*). Differently than the obligating covenant of 34:27, this covenant is presented for the people's willing acceptance, and — following the Yahwistic sacrificial scene (24:4,5*) — is sealed through a blood rite ("the blood of the covenant," *dam-habb^e^rîṯ,* 24:6-8). The covenant is made "on the basis of all these words" (*'al kol-hadd^e^ḇārîm hā'ēlleh,* 24:8), referring to the expressly mentioned (24:7) "book of the covenant" (*sēp̄er habb^e^rîṯ,* 21:2–23:33*), a legal collection whose basic contents derive probably from the period of the early monarchy; in the course of the Deuteronomistic redaction, this collection was inserted into the Sinai pericope as a contractual document, being reworked in the process (20:22aα,24-26; 21:1), so that this covenant is best interpreted as a "contractual covenant" that makes Yahweh's salvific gifts dependent on behavior commensurate with the contract itself, placing Israel before the alternatives "blessing" or "curse."

The tablets of life and tablets of stone in JE became "tablets of the covenant" in the basic text of Dt. 9:7b–10:11 (*lûḥōṯ habb^e^rîṯ,* 9:9,11,15) in Moses' hands, through

---

56. Gese, *Das ferne und nahe Wort;* Aharoni, 153f.
57. Cf. Dohmen, 131f.
58. *Exodus,* 119.

whose shattering (9:17) the narrative of the golden calf was developed further into the paradigm of a breach of covenant.[59]

Within the framework of a revision of the JE Sinai theophany for Deuteronomy (the basic text of Dt. 5 and 9f.), an early Deuteronomistic author composed the basic text of the Decalog (5:6-8a*,9b*,10a,17-21*) as a universal, perpetually valid basic law, placing it before the parenetically introduced Deuteronomic law. A later Deuteronomistic redactor (also responsible for the insertion of the book of the covenant) expanded this basic text into the "ten commandments" (5:9a,11-16), associating it with the tablets. From now on, Yahweh writes the Decalog, which now advances to become the content of the covenant, on "*two* tablets of stone" (*šᵉnê luḥōṯ ʾᵃḇānîm,* 5:22; 4:13; cf. 9:10,11; 10:1,3; Ex. 34:1,4), which Moses now holds in only one hand.[60]

A Deuteronomistic redactor, who while combining Deuteronomy with the Tetrateuch had to clarify the relationship between the privilege code within the JE covenant of obligation (Ex. 34) on the one hand, and the Decalog of the Horeb covenant on the other, transformed Ex. 34 with the aid of Dt. 9f. and Ex. 32 into a covenant renewal (Ex. 34:1,4aα,b[9b],11b,17,27*,28), whereby the privilege code acquired the function of a second Decalog.[61]

5. *Priestly.* The most extensive passages in the Sinai pericope come from P and its redactional expansions. General consensus obtains regarding the basic components of P, even though opinions differ occasionally concerning just what belongs to P^G and what to P^S or R^P. The variety of the events and activities P locates at Sinai is also evident in the fact that according to the P chronology the Israelites camp there for almost a year before moving on to Kadesh (Nu. 10:11ff.).

According to P^G, the Israelites come to the Sinai desert in the third month after the departure from Egypt (Ex. 19:1). There the theophany takes place according to P's transcendent understanding of God; the "glory of Yahweh,"[62] whose appearance was "like a devouring fire" (cf. Dt. 4:24; 9:3), descends onto the top of Mt. Sinai, "the cloud" then covering the mountain for six days (cf. Ex. 40:34), until on the seventh day (cf. Gen. 1:1–2:4a) God calls to Moses from within the cloud, and Moses enters into the mysterious darkness (Ex. 24:14-18aα).

Here at Sinai, Israel's cult is established in three revelations of Yahweh's glory (Ex. 24; 40; Lev. 9), constituting thereby "the congregation" itself.[63] Here P has radically eliminated the covenant and covenantal obligation as well as the giving of the law, the specific elements of the older Sinai tradition. W. Zimmerli sees this as a conscious reaction to Israel's failure regarding the law.[64] This is why P displaces the establishment

59. Hossfeld, 159.

60. Hossfeld, 160, 283.

61. Hossfeld, 210, 212.

62. Cf. C. Westermann, "Die Herrlichkeit Gottes in der Priesterschrift," *Wort, Gebot, Glaube. FS W. Eichrodt. ATANT* 59 (1970), 227-49, esp. 230ff.

63. → עדה *ʿēḏâ.*

64. *TZ* 16 (1960) 278f.

of covenantal status from the Sinai covenant, standing under the auspices of the law, into the more strongly accentuated covenant with Abraham (Gen. 17); the latter, however, was not a "pure covenant of grace"[65] insofar as the programmatic exhortation to perfection ("walk before me and be blameless," Gen. 17:1) comes across like "a prolepsis of the Decalog."[66] The place of the proclamation of the law is taken by the establishment of the expiatory, apotropaic cult,[67] whose heart, commensurate with the covenant formula "Israel is Yahweh's people, Yahweh is Israel's God" (cf. Gen. 17:8), is God's presence in his sanctuary, in the midst of his people (Ex. 29:45). Thus during a forty-day sojourn on the mountain, Moses receives precise instructions for the construction of the "tent of meeting" (a combination of tent, ark, and Jerusalem temple) with its attendant cultic accoutrements, and for installing Aaron and his sons as priests through anointing and other royal symbols (Ex. 25–31*). As soon as the sanctuary is built (Ex. 35–40* [P^S?]), "the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the glory of Yahweh filled the tabernacle" (Ex. 40:34). After Aaron and his sons have been consecrated as priests (Lev. 8), they present for the first time both for themselves and for the people an expiatory and burnt offering (Lev. 9:1-21).

After Moses and Aaron bless the people, the glory of Yahweh appears for a third time, eliciting (not fear and terror, as with E, Ex. 20:18ff., but rather) joy and worship (Lev. 9:23). P's strong emphasis on God's transcendence, no longer allowing any direct access, makes a special caste of priests necessary. This mediating function of the clergy is expressed symbolically in the organization of the camp in Nu. 2:17, with the priests and Levites encamped like a protective wall of separation between the sanctuary and the people. After a census of the people (Nu. 1*) and the Levites (Nu. 3f.), the Israelites depart from Sinai.

In the course of time, three extensive textual blocks of a cultic-ritual nature were inserted (along with many other expansions) into this P^G, taking up almost the entire book of Leviticus: the sacrificial torah in Lev. 1–7*, the purity torah in Lev. 11–15*, and the Holiness Code in Lev. 17–26*. These sections are by no means unified but rather possess a long and varied pre- and posthistory. Thus according to H. Graf Reventlow, the Holiness Code represents an originally independent, successively expanded law collection, whereas according to K. Elliger it is a collection conceived for P from the very beginning to ameliorate the lack of any extracultic giving of the law associated with Sinai.[68]

In the final redaction of the Pentateuch, the role of Moses was amplified (Ex. 19:3bβ,9) and the holiness of the revelatory mountain (the "torah mountain") was more stringently reinforced (19:12b-13,15b,22,24 = R^P). The Sinai summit is displaced into the transcendent, and becomes a glittering sapphire surface (Ex. 24:9-11*). Zenger now ascribes this text, one customarily viewed as "extremely old," to R^P, and no longer

65. Ibid., 279.

66. Elliger, 197.

67. Cf. Koch.

68. Reventlow, *Das Heiligkeitsgesetz formgeschichtlich untersucht. WMANT* 6 (1961); Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966).

to JE.[69] According to M. Haelvoet, this piece belongs to the oldest parts of the Sinai pericope, whereas according to H. H. Schmid, as an independent tradition not specific to the source, it neither originally belonged to the Sinai pericope nor presupposes it in any way.[70]

Since the Pentateuch redaction had pushed the Deuteronomic Decalog to the periphery, a Priestly redactor, reacting to its dignity, reworked it slightly (cf. the sabbath commandment) and placed it before the entire Sinai event in Ex. 20:1-19,21 as the quintessence of all cultic and social regulations.[71] He saw in the Decalog the "basic order" that Yahweh gives directly to his people from heaven, without any prophetic or cultic mediation (20:22). In view of the Exodus Decalog, R^P appropriates in 34:29 the Deuteronomistic understanding of the tablets and creates from it the "two tablets of the testimony" (*šᵉnê luḥōṯ hāʿēḏuṯ,* 31:18; 32:15; 34:29), emphasizing that they were written on both sides (32:15b) and that God was their author (32:16).[72]

Thus the notion of Sinai as a mountain upon which Moses received the two tablets of the law — a notion that has now become primary — belongs to the latest literary stratum, i.e., to the stratum with the historically least and yet theologically greatest significance.

VI. Suggested Locations.

1. *Serbal.* Until the mid-19th century, no one doubted that the traditional Jebel Mûsā, near the Monastery of St. Catherine, was the Sinai of the Bible. After J. L. Burckhardt aired his suspicion that the imposing Mt. Serbal (2070 m. [6790 ft.]), situated farther to the west in the central Sinaitic mountains, might have been Sinai (it was already identified as a holy mountain on the basis of its numerous Nabatean inscriptions), this theory (since abandoned) was defended most decisively by the two Egyptologists R. Lepsius (1846) and G. Ebers (1872).[73] Burckhardt's hypothesis, most recently revived by Hölscher, according to which the veneration of Serbal as Sinai was transferred to Jebel Mûsā in the 6th century, has long been repudiated by the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae (Egeriae)* discovered in 1884.[74]

2. *Volcano Hypothesis.* In contrast, the volcano hypothesis continues to find adherents even today.[75] Already opposed in 1634 by A. Rivet, this hypothesis was typical for the Enlightenment but was unable to establish itself, since Jebel Mûsā, revered without criticism as Sinai, was not a volcano. Thus the English geographer C. T. Beke sought Sinai,

69. For the former see *Israel am Sinai,* 134; for the latter, *Sinaitheophanie,* 178, 216f.

70. Haelvoet, 389; H. H. Schmidt, 111. Cf. also E. Ruprecht, "Ex 24,9-11 als Beispiel lebendiger Erzähltradition aus der Zeit des babylonischen Exils," *Werden und Wirken des ATs. FS C. Westermann* (Göttingen, 1980), 138-73.

71. Hossfeld, 212f.

72. Cf. Hossfeld, 146, 212.

73. Burckhardt, *Travels in Syria and the Holy Land* (1822; repr. New York, 1983), 604-14. On the Nabatean inscriptions see B. Moritz.

74. *Itinerarium Egeriae. Egeria's Travels* (London, 1971); also *Egeria: Diary of a Pilgrimage. Ancient Christian Writers* 38 (New York, 1970).

75. Most recently B. Zuber and E. Kramer.

whose volcanic character he once again emphasized,[76] outside the peninsula named after it; he believed to have found it 15 km. (about 9 mi.) northeast of Aqaba, in the Jebel en-Nur or Jebel Bagir (1592 m. [5223 ft.]),[77] but then abandoned the volcano hypothesis again after learning that this was never a fire-spewing mountain. The hypothesis was revived by pentateuchal criticism, after J. Wellhausen made the distinction between the mount of God in Kadesh (the "true setting of the Mosaic story") and Sinai, situated elsewhere, which G. F. Moore and B. Stade locate on the east side of the Gulf of Aqaba, an area also identified with Midian.[78] In contrast to the Sinai Peninsula, the partly volcanic origin of this region (called Arab. *ḥarrāt*) supported H. Gunkel's view that, based on the portrayal of the theophany in Ex. 19:16-19, Sinai must have been a volcano.[79]

Since then, location suggestions have not been lacking that are based in part on the dubious similarity with modern Arabic names. A. H. McNeile sought Sinai near Kadesh, and Horeb, in contrast, in northwestern Arabia in the Jebel Ḥarb (2350 m. [7710 ft.]).[80] A. Musil suggested that the volcano Ḥallat al-Badr in the Ḥarrāt region was Sinai, whereas later he suspected Horeb = Sinai to be located in the vicinity of the Šeʿīb al-Hrob.[81] J. Koenig remained with Ḥallat al-Badr, since the Arabic designation al-Badr ("full moon") corresponds exactly to the biblical name Sinai, which derives allegedly from the moon god Sin, which is why E and D replaced it with Horeb, having found the lunar allusion offensive. According to Gese's calculations, the (pilgrimage) route of eleven days given in Dt. 1:2 leads to the same mountain.[82]

This obstinate volcano hypothesis cannot be reconciled with the oldest tradition of Sinai,[83] which speaks of a mountain in Seir; it is based, as are attempts to locate it in Midian, on dubious and in part outdated literary and traditio-critical analyses, but above all on an impermissible naturalizing combination of theophany phenomena in the individual Pentateuch sources, phenomena that should be given varying theological interpretations.

3. *Around Kadesh-barnea.* The original location is probably best approximated by those who, albeit with differing justification, seek Sinai in the extended environs of Kadesh. Thus G. Hölscher considers one of the mountains southeast of Kadesh to be Sinai, but then locates Horeb, following Dt. 1:2, in Midian.[84] H. Graetz identifies Sinai as the Jebel ʿAra'if, situated 32 km. (about 20 mi.) south of ʿAin Qadeš; R. Kittel also

76. *Mount Sinai a Volcano,* 8-14, 39-44.

77. *Beke's Discoveries,* 387-488.

78. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Israel* (1885; repr. Atlanta, 1994), 342ff.; Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Comm. on the Book of Judges. ICC* (1895), 140; Stade, *Die Entstehung des Volkes Israel* (Giessen, 1897), 12.

79. Gunkel, *DLZ* 24 (1903) 3058f. Cf. O. Loth, *ZDMG* 22 (1868) 365-82.

80. *Exodus. Westminster Commentaries* (London, 1908; ^{2}1917), p. cv.

81. Musil, *Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Phil.-hist. Kl.* 48 (1911), 154; idem, *The Northern Ḥeğâz* (New York, 1926), 269, 296-98.

82. *ZAW* 79 (1967) 137-54.

83. See III above.

84. Pp. 128f.

favors this mountain, which G. Westphal views as Horeb, the historic mount of God of Moses in Edom.[85] T. Wiegand favors the monumental Jebel Yelek (Ya'allaq; 1075 m. [3527 ft.]), situated southwest of Kadesh and visible from afar.[86]

A location farther removed from Kadesh is favored by C. S. Jarvis, who suggests Jebel Hilāl (914 m. [about 3,000 ft.]), approximately 40 km. (25 mi.) to the west, and M. Harel, who suggests Jebel Sin Bišr (618 m. [2027 ft.]), approximately 40 km. (25 mi.) southeast of Suez.[87] H. Grimme and S. Landersdorfer believe Sinai to be the Sarābiṭ al-Ḫādim, whereas D. Nielsen locates it in Petra.[88]

4. *Traditional View (Jebel Mûsā).* The traditional view, that Jebel Mûsā (2285 m. [7500 ft.]) is Sinai, called by this Arabic name since the 16th century, can be traced back to Christian hermits who settled there ca. A.D. 320. As shown by the account of the Pilgerin Egeria (Aetheria), by the year 400 they had already "located" near all the biblical backdrops associated with Sinai. Since Eusebius saw two different but adjacent mountains in Sinai and Horeb, from the 14th to the 17th century the Mount of St. Catherine (2,638 m. [8,650 ft.]) was usually identified as Sinai, and the Jebel Mûsā as Horeb, though sometimes this was reversed.[89] E. Robinson declared Râs eṣ-Ṣafṣafeh (2,085 m. [6,840 ft.]), situated in front of the Jebel Mûsā and easily visible from the plain of er-Râḥa, to be the real mountain of the law.[90]

The basis of the identification of the Jebel Mûsā as Sinai is not known. In any event, Nabateans were already making pilgrimages there in the second and third centuries, as attested by numerous inscriptions. Although the anchorites possibly traced this veneration back into the Mosaic period, another explanation is also conceivable. According to the Arabic geographer Yaqut (1179-1229), the Nabateans (i.e., Aramaic-speaking peoples) called every mountain covered with trees and bushes Ṭūr Sīnā. It is thus possible that they bestowed this name on the mountain groupings there on the basis of the numerous dendrites (plantlike and bushlike crystallizations in stone caused by hydrous oxide of manganese) that pilgrims repeatedly mentioned and viewed as a miraculous memorial to the burning thornbush. Thus the hermits believed that this was the Sinai (LXX *Sina*!) of the Bible.[91]

Maiberger

---

85. Graetz, 357f.; Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel,* 2 vols. (Stuttgart/Gotha, ^{3}1916), I, 535 (not in Eng. trans.); Westphal, *Jahwes Wohnstätten nach den Anschauungen der alten Hebräer. BZAW* 15 (1908), 42f.

86. *Sinai* (Berlin/Leipzig, 1920), 53f.

87. Jarvis, "The Forty Years' Wanderings of the Israelites," *PEFQS* 40 (1938), 32, 37; Harel, *Masa'ê Sinai* (Tel Aviv, 1969), 274ff.

88. Grimme, *Althebräische Inschriften vom Sinai* (Hannover, 1923), 87-90; Landersdorfer, *Könige. HS* III/2 (1927), 118f.

89. Eusebius, *Das Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen,* ed. E. Klostermann (1904; repr. Hildesheim, 1966), 172.

90. *Biblical Researches in Palestine and in the Adjacent Regions* (Boston, 1856), 3 vols., esp. vol. 1.

91. Cf. Maiberger, 82-84.

סָכַךְ *sākak;* *מְסֻכָה *m^e^sukâ;* *סָךְ *sāk;* *סֹךְ *sōk;* סֻכָּה *sukkâ;* סֹכֵךְ *sōkēk*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT Occurrences. III. *sākak* I-III: 1. Qal; 2. Niphal; 3. Polel; 4. Hiphil. IV. *sukkâ:* 1. Booth; 2. Feast of Booths. V. **m^e^sukâ, *sāk, *sōk,* and *sōkēk*. VI. LXX. VII. Qumran.

---

sākak. S. Aalen, "Laubhüttenfest," *BHHW,* II (1964), 1052f.; A. Alt, "Zelte und Hütten," *Alttestamentliche Studien. FS F. Nötscher. BBB* 1 (1950), 16-25 = *KlSchr* III (1959), 233-42; N.-E. Andreasen, "Festival and Freedom: A Study of an OT Theme," *Int* 28 (1974) 281-97; E. Auerbach, "Das Fest der Lese am Abschluss des Jahres," *VT* 3 (1953) 186f.; I. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie. Angelos-Lehrbücher* I ([3]1927; repr. Hildesheim/New York, 1974), esp. 310; O. Bischofberger, E. Otto, and D. Mach, "Feste und Feiertage I-III," *TRE,* XI (1983), 93-115; G. Braulik, "Die Freude des Festes," *Theologisches Jahrbuch* (Leipzig, 1983), 13-54 = *Leiturgia — Koinonia — Diakonia. FS Kardinal F. König,* ed. R. W. Schulte (Vienna, 1980), 127-79; H. Cazelles, "La fête des tentes en Israël," *BVC* 65 (1965) 32-44; D. J. A. Clines, "The Evidence for an Autumnal New Year in Pre-Exilic Israel Reconsidered," *JBL* 93 (1974) 22-40; K. Elliger, "Sukkoth," *BHHW,* III (1966), 1887f.; I. N. Fabricant, *A Guide to Succoth. Jewish Chronicle Publications* (London, 1958); M. Flashar, "Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter. VI," *ZAW* 32 (1912) 241; T. H. Gaster, *Festivals of the Jewish Year: A Modern Interpretation and Guide* (New York, 1953); H. Haag, "Das liturgische Leben der Qumrangemeinde. II. Feste und Festkalender," *Das Buch des Bundes. Aufsätze zur Bibel und zu ihrer Welt* (Düsseldorf, 1980), 127-33; B. Halper, "The Participial Formations of the Geminate Verbs. III," *ZAW* 30 (1910) 207; E. Kutsch, "Das Herbstfest in Israel" (diss., Mainz, 1955); idem, "Feste und Feiern. II. In Israel," *RGG*[3], II (1958), 910-17; idem, "'. . . am Ende des Jahres.' Zur Datierung des israelitischen Herbstfestes in Ex 23,16," *ZAW* 83 (1971) 15-21; idem, "Von den israelitisch-jüdischen Hauptfesten," *Im Lande der Bibel* 20 (1974) 22-26; idem, I. Jakobovits, and A. Kanof, "Sukkot," *EncJud,* XV (1972), 495-502; R. Martin-Achard, *Essai biblique sur les fêtes d'Israël* (Geneva, 1974); J. C. de Moor, *New Year with Canaanites and Israelites. Kamper Cahiers* 21 (Kampen, 1972); S. Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien II: Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie* (Kristiania, 1925, repr. 1966); E. Otto, "Sigmund Mowinckels Bedeutung für die gegenwärtige Liturgiedebatte," *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 19 (1975) 18-36; H. N. Richardson, "*SKT* (Amos 9:11): 'Booth' or 'Succoth'?" *JBL* 92 (1973) 375-81; S. Safrai, "*Sukkôṯ birušālayim bîmê bêṯ šēnî,*" *Mah^a^nayim* 51 (1961/62) 20-22; idem, *Die Wallfahrt im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels. Forschungen zum jüdisch-christlichen Dialog* 3 (1981); G. Sauer, "Die Tafeln von Deir 'Allā," *ZAW* 81 (1969) 145-56; idem, "Israels Feste und ihr Verhältnis zum Jahweglauben," *Studien zum Pentateuch. FS W. Kornfeld* (Vienna/Freiburg, 1977), 135-41; N. H. Snaith, *The Jewish New Year Festival: Its Origins and Development* (London, 1947); S. Springer, *Neuinterpretation im AT. Untersucht an den Themenkreisen des Herbstfestes und der Königspsalmen in Israel. SBB* (1979); J.-M. de Tarragon, *Le culte à Ugarit d'après les textes de la pratique en cunéiformes alphabétiques. CahRB* 19 (1980); P. Volz, *Das Neujahrsfest Jahwes* (Tübingen, 1912); L. Wächter, "Der jüdische Festkalender: Geschichte und Gegenwart," *Die Zeichen der Zeit* 34 (1980) 259-67; A. Weiser, *The Psalms. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), esp. 23-52; F.-E. Wilms, *Freude vor Gott: Kult und Fest in Israel* (Regensburg, 1981); S. J. Zevin, *Hammô'^a^dîm bah^a^lākâ* (Tel Aviv, 1963); H. Zimmern, *Das babylonische Neujahrsfest. AO* 25/3 (1926).

I. Etymology. Whereas most earlier scholars postulated only one root *skk* in Biblical Hebrew, some current scholars assign the OT occurrences of *skk* to three different roots.[1] Others assume the presence of two roots *skk*.[2]

According to *HAL*, the basic stem of the root *skk* I, to which most OT occurrences are assigned, means above all "to shut off as a protection"; cf. Arab. *sakka*, "stop up," "repair," etc.; Mand. *skk* I, peal "be hindered"; pael "hinder, prevent"; Akk. *sakāku(m)*, "be stopped up, closed (an ear, sense, etc.)"; Tigr. *šekšeka*, "be stopped up"; Jewish Aram. *s^eḵaḵ*, "fence in"; Syr. *sakkeḵ*, pael "close off."[3] The two hapax legomena **sāḵ* (Ps. 42:5[Eng. v. 4]) and *sōḵēḵ* (Nah. 2:6[5]) are viewed as conceivable derivatives.[4]

HAL distinguishes two other roots from this one root *skk* I. First, *skk* II, for which in the qal (only Ps. 139:13) one assumes the meaning "weave, shape" (otherwise only in the niphal, Prov. 8:23, if this is not to be assigned to *nsk* II;[5] also conj. Ps. 2:6; finally, polel, Job 10:11); according to *HAL*, the postulated root is otherwise attested only in Middle Hebrew and Aramaic.[6] No noun in the OT can be traced back to this root. Second, *skk* III, believed to be attested in the OT only in the hiphil (Jgs. 3:24; 1 S. 24:4[3]) and possibly in the qal (conj. Lam. 3:43,44; conj. Job 29:4), with the meaning "cover" or "conceal"; cf. Arab. *sakka* VIII, "become dense (vegetation)," and Middle Heb. piel "cover."[7] *HAL* associates with this root the nouns **sōḵ*, "thicket," "booth"; *sukkâ*, "thicket," "booth," "Feast of Booths"; and **m^esuḵâ*, "covering"(?),[8] as well as the place-names *sukkôṯ* and *s^eḵāḵâ* (see below). The term *sukkâ* is perhaps not deverbal; cf. Akk. *sukku*, "chapel."[9]

This survey already shows that the division of the OT *skk* occurrences into three separate roots undertaken by *HAL* cannot without further study be considered definitive. The uncertainty becomes even greater considering that the boundaries between *skk* (I-III) and, e.g., *swk* I and *nsk* I-II are not always clear.[10] Furthermore, consideration must also be given to, among other things, the close relationship between *skk* and *śkk*.[11]

II. OT Occurrences. The difficulty in determining the character of the biblical root *skk* can be illustrated best by trying to register the exact number of OT occurrences. The following numbers are according to *HAL*. The verb *sāḵaḵ* occurs 13 times in the OT in the qal: 3 times in Exodus (25:20; 37:9; 40:3); twice each in Job (1:10; 40:22

---

1. Earlier, e.g., *GesTh*, II, 951a-53a; most recently, *HAL*, II, 754.
2. E.g., *BDB*, 696b-97b; *CHAL*, 256a.
3. See, respectively, *HAL*, II, 754; Lane, 1386c; *MdD*, 330b-31a; *AHw*, 1010b; *WbTigr*, 223b, and Leslau, *Contributions*, 36; Jastrow, 990; *LexSyr*, 464.
4. See V below.
5. Cf. *HAL*, II, 754.
6. Cf. Jastrow, 990: Heb. *sāḵaḵ* I, piel and hiphil, "weave"; Aram. *s^eḵaḵ*, pael, "weave."
7. Lane, 1387a; Jastrow, 990a: *skk* I.
8. See V below.
9. *AHw*, II, 1055b.
10. *HAL*, II, 745, 703, respectively.
11. Cf. *CHAL*, 352a.

conj.), the Psalms (139:13; 140:8[7]), Lamentations (3:43,44), and Ezekiel (28:14,16); and once each in 1 Kings (8:7) and 1 Chronicles (28:18). Of these 13 occurrences, 12 are assigned to *skk* I (although *KBL*³ has mistakenly omitted Lam. 3:43, *HAL* includes it), and one to *skk* II (Ps. 139:13); to this is added Job 29:4 conj. (*skk* I or III); finally, Lam. 3:43f. conj. can possibly be assigned to *skk* III (cf. *skk* I). The niphal of *skk* occurs only once (Prov. 8:23, *skk* II);[12] also Ps. 2:6 conj. (*skk* II). The hiphil of *skk* is attested 7 times: 5 times as *skk* I (Ex. 40:21; Job 3:23; 38:8; Ps. 5:12[11]; 91:4) and twice as *skk* III (Jgs. 3:24; 1 S. 24:4). Finally, a polel form is attested in Job 10:11 (*skk* II). Altogether, this yields 22 OT occurrences for the verb *skk* (I-III).

At the same time, however, many elements of uncertainty attach to this enumeration. On the one hand, for example, *HAL* classifies *śaḵtā* in Job 1:10, although written with *ś*, to *skk* I; Gesenius and Mandelkern, however, correctly understand it as the qal of *śwk*.[13] On the other hand, *HAL* does not list *wᵉśakkōṯî* in Ex. 33:22 s.v. *skk*, which, peculiarly, both Gesenius and Mandelkern do.[14] Additional uncertainty attaches, e.g., to *sōḵēḵ* in Nah. 2:6(5), which *HAL* and Holladay understand as a noun.[15] By contrast, Gesenius and Mandelkern take it as the qal active participle. Regarding the term *yᵉsukkuhû* in Job 40:22, *HAL* does list it under *skk* I qal, but then actually claims it as a conj. from **sōḵ*.[16] *HAL* identifies *nissaḵtî* in Prov. 8:23 partly as the niphal of *skk* II, and partly as the niphal of *nsk* II.[17] One might also note that both Gesenius and Mandelkern see pilpel constructions of *skk* in forms such as *yᵉsaḵsēḵ* and *wᵉsiḵsaḵtî* (Isa. 9:10[11]; 19:2), whereas *HAL* and Holladay understand them, probably correctly, as the pilpel of *swk* I.[18] Similarly, the former understand *yussaḵ* (Ex. 25:29; 37:16) as the hophal of *skk*, the latter, correctly, as the hophal of *nsk* I.[19]

According to *HAL*, the derivatives listed for *skk* I-III are distributed in the OT as follows: **sāḵ* and *sōḵēḵ* (from *skk* I) occur once each (Ps. 42:5[4]; Nah. 2:6[5]); **sōḵ* (from *skk* III) 5 times (Ps. 10:9; 27:5; 76:3[2]; Jer. 25:38; Lam. 2:6; additionally conj. Job 40:22; Ps. 42:5[4]); *sukkâ* (from *skk* III) 30 times (cf. below); and **mᵉsuḵâ* (from *skk* III or *swk*) once (Mic. 7:4).

The term *sukkôṯ* also functions as a place-name in the OT. Here, on the one hand, the Egyptian Succoth, the first encampment during the departure from Egypt, can be eliminated (Ex. 12:37; 13:20; Nu. 33:5,6), since this name is apparently merely a hebraizing of Egyp. *Ṯkw*, and is presumably to be identified with Tell el-Maskûṭah in the Wâdī Ṭumilât east of Pithom.[20] On the other hand, the OT itself associates Trans-

---

12. Cf., however, the niphal of *nsk* II, *HAL*, II, 703.
13. *GesTh*, III, 1323a; Mandelkern, 1116b; so also *CHAL*, 349b.
14. *GesTh*, 951; Mandelkern, 797b. *CHAL*, 352a, again correctly, lists it s.v. *śkk*.
15. *HAL*, II, 754; *CHAL*, 256a.
16. See, respectively, *HAL*, II, 754, 753.
17. See, respectively, *HAL*, II, 754, 703.
18. *HAL*, II, 745; *CHAL*, 254a.
19. *HAL*, II, 703; *CHAL*, 239b.
20. See W. F. Albright, review of F.-M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine II* (Paris, 1938), *JBL* 58 (1939) 186f.; W. H. Schmidt, *Exodus. BK* II (1977), 36. On the identification see *GTTOT*, §420.

jordanian Succoth, near the mouth of the Jabbok River (= Tell Deir ʿAllā or Tell el-Ekhṣaṣ [Aḥṣaṣ]), with *sukkâ,* "booth, tabernacle" (explicitly in Gen. 33:17; see further Josh. 13:27; Jgs. 8:5,6,8,14[bis],15,16; 1 K. 7:46; 2 Ch. 4:17).[21] The "Valley of Succoth" (*ʿēmeq sukkôṯ,* Ps. 60:8[6] par. 108:8[7]) refers probably to the area between ed-Dājme and Tell Deir ʿAllā.[22]

The place-name *s^eḵāḵâ* (Josh. 15:61) is possibly also related to *skk* (III) (cf. */h/skk'* in 3Q15 4:13; 5:2,13).[23] This is probably to be identified either with Khirbet Qumran or, more likely, with Khirbet es-Samrah.[24]

III. *sāḵaḵ I-III.*

1. *Qal.* The 12 (13?) occurrences in the qal of the verb *skk* that *HAL* adduces under *skk* I (to which are added in the qal Ps. 139:13[25] and several conjs. [Job 29:4; Lam. 3:43,44]) are found especially in the following contexts: to express the isolating, shielding, covering function of the cherubim associated with the ark in the Jerusalem temple as well as with the slab over the ark in the tent of meeting of P.[26] Compare also the function of the cherubim in the sanctuary (Ezekiel).

The OT uses *skk* in secular situations only as an exception. Indeed, the only example occurs in Job 40:21f., which relates of the hippopotamus: "Under the lotus plants it lies, in the covert of the reeds and in the marsh. For its shade the lotus trees cover it *(y^esukkuhû ṣe'^elîm ṣil^alô);* the willows of the brook surround it." Since "shade" is more likely the subject of the sentence, however, the text is often emended to *sōḵ na^{ca}ṣûṣîm,* "the leaf arbor of alhagi (is his shade)."[27]

The majority of OT occurrences of *skk* in the qal, however, refer to the cherubim.[28] From the account in the Deuteronomistic history (more exactly: of the Deuteronomistic historian) concerning the temple construction (1 K. 5:15[5:1]–8:66) we learn that at the consecration of the sanctuary, the priests brought Yahweh's ark of the covenant to the "most holy place" *(d^eḇîr)* "underneath the wings of the cherubim." The relation between cherubim and ark is described as follows: "The cherubim spread out their wings to [*'el-,* or "over," *ʿal-,* with 2 Ch. 5:8 and LXX] the place where the ark

21. K. Elliger, "Sukkoth," *BHHW,* III (1966), 1887f.; H. J. Francken, *Excavations at Tell Deir ʿAllā I* (Leiden, 1969), 8f.; idem, *EAEHL,* I, 321ff.; M. Wüst, *Untersuchungen zu den siedlungsgeographischen Texten des ATs I. Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients.* Ser. B, Geisteswissenschaften 9 (Wiesbaden, 1975), 131; cf. also Abel, *Géographie,* II, 470; *GTTOT,* §415.

22. See H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1989), in loc.

23. M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân. DJD* III (1962), 263, 288f.

24. *GTTOT,* §320; F. M. Cross, "Explorations in the Judaean Buqêʿah," *BASOR* 142 (1956) 6, 9ff.

25. Which *HAL,* II, 754, lists under *skk* II.

26. → אהל *'ōhel* (I, 118-30); → מועד *môʿēḏ* (VIII, 167-73).

27. E.g., with B. Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob. KHC* XVI (1897), in loc.; and others. See G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 522.

28. → כרוב *k^erûḇ,* with additional bibliography.

stood; and they covered/separated off (protectively) [*wayyāsōkkû;* 2 Ch. 5:8 has *waykassû;* cf. LXX] the ark and its poles from above." Perhaps we can assume with O. Keel that the two cherubim themselves, with outspread wings, actually constituted Yahweh's throne seat.[29] The two cherubim stood parallel in the *d^e^bîr,* the two outer wings touching the wall, and the two inner wings touching each other, creating thereby a seat; thus did they cover the ark (so also in the Chronicler's parallel, 2 Ch. 5:7f.; cf. also 1 K. 6:23-28; 2 Ch. 3:10-13). This function of the cherubim appears once more in connection with David's final instructions to Solomon concerning the temple construction. David developed a model *(tabnîṯ)* of the throne/cherubim chariot *(hammerkāḇâ)* with golden cherubim "that spread [their wings] and covered/shielded the ark of the covenant of Yahweh" (*l^e^pōr^e^śîm* [*k^e^nāpayim;* cf. 1 K. 8:7; 2 Ch. 5:8] *w^e^sōk^e^kîm 'al-'^a^rôn b^e^rîṯ-YHWH,* 1 Ch. 28:18).

A related conception of the shielding/covering wings of the cherubim also occurs in connection with the tent of meeting of the wilderness wanderings (Ex. 25:1–31:18, or 35:1–40:28), where P apparently draws on several older tent traditions.[30] The account relates that "the cherubim shall spread out their wings above, so that they (protectively) separate off/cover the slab with their wings" (*sōk^e^kîm b^e^kanpêhem 'al-hakkappōreṯ,* 37:9).

A different usage of *skk* is visible in Ex. 40:3: "You [Moses] shall put in it the ark of the testimony, and you shall shield/screen off the ark with the veil [*w^e^sakkōṯā 'al-hā'ārōn 'eṯ-happārōḵeṯ*]." It is also possible, however, that this text, too, originally referred to the atonement slab covering the ark (cf. Sam. *hakkappōreṯ*).

The qal of *skk* is also used in the lamentation over the king of Tyre, which mentions the cherub as the "covering" *(hassōkēk)* inhabitant of the garden of God (Ezk. 28:11-19). This text is extremely difficult, and has possibly even been corrupted or interpolated with glosses. It seems the king of Tyre is being portrayed here as a cherub; emendations that separate the figure of the cherub from that of the king are hardly tenable.[31] Yet this cherub of Tyre exhibits its own features, as shown by the divine oracle concerning its demise (vv. 14-16). This impressive text does not say that the cherub is identical with the first human being, but only that it was once on a mountain of God covered with precious stones. The "covering/protecting" task of the cherub might have been appropriated from the temple tradition (see above), though it might also imply that the cherub of Tyre was once "the protector" of the mountain of God; cf. W. Zimmerli: "The sacred object which he 'blocks off' *(skk)* is, as opposed to Ex 25:20; 37:9, not the covering of the ark over which Yahweh appears, but the lofty

---

29. *The Symbolism of the Biblical World* (Eng. trans., New York, 1978), 169; cf. also T. N. D. Mettinger, *The Dethronement of Sabaoth. CB* 18 (Eng. trans. 1982), 20-24.

30. Cf. B. S. Childs, *Book of Exodus. OTL* (1974), 529-43, 633f.

31. See esp. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 81-95. Cf. H. J. van Dijk, *Ezekiel's Prophecy on Tyre. BietOr* 20 (1968), 113ff.; concerning traditio-historical connections with the Adapa myth (*ANET,* 101-3), the Enkidu episode in Gilgamesh (*ANET,* 73f., Tablet 1), and Gen. 2–3; Job 15:7-8, cf. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1984), 245-48.

mountain seat of God, far removed from human proximity."[32] Ezekiel is also familiar with the notion of the cherubim as keepers of the ark and as throne bearers, or the throne, of Yahweh (10:1-3). We cannot determine with certainty the extent to which the prophet is also employing notions appropriated from Tyrian royal ideology.

The qal of *skk* can also have Yahweh as its subject. Lam. 3:40-47 prays to the *deus absconditus:* "You have separated yourself in anger [from the people of God] *(sakkōṯâ bā'ap)* and pursued us, slaying without pity. You have separated yourself [from us] with a cloud *(sakkōṯâ be'ānān lāḵ),* so that no prayer can pass through" (3:43f.).[33]

The Israelites, however, knew Yahweh not primarily as the angry God who conceals himself but rather above all as the Lord who shields his people from all hostile forces, as expressed in the prayer of the individual: "Yahweh, my Lord, my strong deliverer, you shield my head on the day of battle *(sakkōṯâ lᵉrō'šî bᵉyôm nāšeq)*" (Ps. 140:8[7]).

Yahweh's protection against all of Israel's enemies is naturally also evident in the daily life of the believer. Thus does Satan speak in the prologue to Job: "Have you [Yahweh] not put a hedge about him [Job] [i.e., closed off any (hostile) access to him; *saḵtā ba'ᵃḏô* in some mss.], and his house and all that he has, on every side?" (Job 1:10; MT reads *śaḵtā* from *śwk,* with a related meaning).[34]

The only occurrence in the qal of the root *skk* II postulated by *HAL* is in Ps. 139. In a section (vv. 13-18) clearly influenced by the priestly understanding of the creation of human beings,[35] Yahweh is addressed: "Indeed, you are the one who created *(qānîṯā)* my kidneys" (par. *tᵉsukkēnî bᵉḇeṭen 'immî,* recently understood to mean "who knit me together in my mother's womb," v. 13).[36] This interpretation, however, remains uncertain; of course, it is dependent also on the understanding of the par. *qnh* as "create, form"[37] (cf. also Prov. 8:23; peculiarly, here *HAL* identifies *skk,* parallel with *qnh,* as *skk* III). The LXX (among others) points in a different direction: *antelábou mou ek gastrós mētrós mou;* cf. Syr.

The existence of a special root *skk* III, "conceal," is questionable. First, for the basic stem one can only adduce conjectures; second, the substance of these reconstructed texts is quite comparable with occurrences of *skk* I. Thus in Lam. 3:43 W. Rudolph reads *'appeḵā* instead of MT *bā'ap,* translating: "you concealed [your countenance] and pursued us, slaying without pity, you concealed yourself in a cloud, so that no prayer could pass through" (vv. 43f.);[38] neither is an interpretation according to *skk* I really plausible. One should stay with the MT. The other passage adduced by *HAL* is Job 29:4. While it is indeed probable that *bᵉsōḏ* here is a scribal error, and that one

---

32. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2,* 92.

33. Concerning *lāḵ,* see B. Albrektson, *Studies in the Text and Theology of the Book of Lamentations* (Lund, 1963), 157; concerning W. Rudolph's suggested emendation, see below.

34. Cf. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 79f.

35. Cf. M. Sæbø, "Salme 139 og visdomsdiktningen," *Tidsskrift for teologi og kirke* 34 (1966) 167-84.

36. E.g., Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 510.

37. See W. H. Schmidt, "קנה *qnh* to acquire," *TLOT,* III, 1151-53.

38. W. Rudolph, *Das Buch Ruth. Das Hohelied. Die Klagelieder. KAT* XVII/1-3 (1962), 229f.

should follow LXX, Symmachus, and Syr. in reading *b^e sōḵ* (qal inf. const. of *skk*),[39] the sense (with reference, e.g., to Ps. 140:8[7]; see above) is "(if only I were) as in the days of my early time, when God protected by tent," i.e., when God "separated off, blockaded my tent" from enemies of all kinds, meaning essentially "enveloped it protectively."

2. *Niphal.* The niphal of *skk* occurs possibly once in the OT. The passage (Prov. 8:23) is not unequivocal. In the present context of the self-attestation of Wisdom concerning its own origin (vv. 22-31, MT?), the expression *m^e ʿôlām nissaḵtî* is to be interpreted from the perspective of the preceding *qānānî* (v. 22, "acquire,"[40] "create,"[41] or — perhaps best — "beget, bring forth";[42] cf. Ps. 139:13; see above); compare also the following *ḥôlāltî* (v. 24, "be brought forth [amid labor pains]").[43] If *nissaḵtî* is understood as the niphal of *skk* II, "be formed, made," then Wisdom is saying: "I was made before time, before the first, before the beginnings of the earth" (perhaps conj. *n^e sakkōṯî*);[44] however, cf. also *nsk* II niphal.[45] The most natural understanding, however, remains an interpretation of *nissaḵtî* as the niphal of *nsk* I: "I was set up before time."[46] If this is correct, it eliminates one further argument supporting a root *skk* II in the OT.

3. *Polel.* The third occurrence of the postulated *skk* II (Job 10:11) contains the only polel form of *skk* in the OT. Job asks whether it is conceivable that the Creator wants to destroy his artfully constructed creation (the human being) (10:8-12). According to Fohrer, Job says: "Your hands fashioned and made me. . . . You clothed me with skin and flesh, and knit me together with bones and sinews *(ûḇa^a ṣāmôṯ w^e giḏîm t^e sōḵ^e ḵēnî).*"[47] The extent to which Job portrays the Creator here as the artful weaver of human beings is, however, questionable. Is Job not thinking rather of God as the constructor of the housing that is the body itself (cf. Wis. 9:15)?[48] Perhaps Job understands the human body as *sukkâ;* the translation would then be: "You clothed me with skin and flesh, you covered me [set me up as *sukkâ*] with bones and sinews." This renders extremely questionable all 3 passages adduced by *HAL* for the root *skk* II in the OT.

---

39. So, among others, C. F. Houbigant, *Notae criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti libros cum hebraice* (Frankfurt, 1777); J. C. Döderlin, *Biblia Hebraica* (Leipzig, 1793); J. A. Dathe, *Jobus, Proverbia Salomonis, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticarum* (Halle, 1789); Fohrer, *Hiob;* cf. *BHS.*

40. Cf. Schmidt, *TLOT,* III, 1151f.

41. Ibid.; H. Gese, *Vom Sinai zum Zion. BEvT* 64 (1974), 139.

42. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 85, 87.

43. See Gese, *Vom Sinai,* 139; Plöger, *Sprüche,* 85, 87.

44. So Gese, *Vom Sinai,* 139.

45. *HAL,* II, 703, with reference to Gemser and Keel.

46. So most recently Plöger, *Sprüche,* 86f.

47. Fohrer, *Hiob,* 197; cf. 200.

48. Cf. further St.-B., III, 517 on 2 Cor. 5:1.

4. *Hiphil.* According to *HAL, skk* I occurs 5 times in the hiphil, and *skk* III twice.[49] Among the 5 occurrences of *skk* I, Ex. 40:21 can be interpreted without difficulty; the instructions given in 40:3[50] are carried out as follows: "and [Moses] screened off the ark of the testimony [with the veil]" (*wayyāseḵ ʿal ʾᵃrôn hāʿēḏûṯ;* Sam. reads the qal here: *yissōḵ*). The other 4 occurrences describe God's activity as shielding or separating in a positive sense, or blocking off in a negative sense.

The psalmist in Ps. 5:12(11) speaks of the joy that the righteous experience within Yahweh's protective sphere: "But let all who trust in you rejoice, and ever sing for joy . . . you shield them *(wᵉṯāsēḵ ʿālêmô),* that those who love your name exult in you" (the emendation *wᵉṯāsēḵ ʿālāyw* with transposition in v. 13 is not very persuasive).[51]

Ps. 91:4 describes how Yahweh protects the persecuted like a bird with outspread wings:[52] "With his wings he shields you (*bᵉʾeḇrāṯāw* [MT *bᵉʾeḇrāṯô,* haplography?] *yāseḵ lāḵ*), under his wings you will find refuge." This might be alluding to the cherubim; "The wings of the cherubim are symbols of the protective area into which the *deus praesens* takes the helpless person."[53]

Job 38:8 mentions Yahweh's actions of separation and delimitation during creation: Yahweh "closed off [in the beginning] the sea with two gates, when it burst forth from the womb" (*wayyāseḵ biḏlāṯayim yām bᵉgîḥô mereḥem yēṣēʾ;* the frequently suggested variant *mî sāḵ,* "who closed off," is unfounded).[54] The Ugaritic myth of the conquest of the primal sea may be providing the background here,[55] although in this case there can be no allusion to any struggle with chaos, since Yahweh is the omnipotent creator. In his unfathomable wisdom, he immediately closed off the sea with two gates as it broke out of its womb during the primal age, and these gates — in a fashion similar to that of ancient oriental door gods, though robbed of their autonomy — function as trustworthy guards.[56]

Job's first discourse (3:1-26) also mentions a completely negative divine act of separating and delimiting. Whereas in the prologue Satan had objected against Job that Yahweh himself had once put a hedge around him (1:10),[57] Job himself now asks in 3:23 why God gives life "to the man whose way is hid, and whom God has hedged in *(wayyāseḵ ʾᵉlôah baʿᵃḏô)*" (cf. also *sgr bᵉʿaḏ,* Jgs. 3:22; 1 S. 1:6; *ḥtm bᵉʿaḏ,* Job 9:7; and *gdr bᵉʿaḏ,* Lam. 3:7). God has not cut Job off in order to protect him against enemies, but rather to cut off any access to help.

HAL ascribes 2 hiphil occurrences in the Deuteronomistic history to the presumed root *skk* III. Both instances (Jgs. 3:24; 1 S. 24:4) involve the euphemistic expression

49. See I above.
50. See III.1 above.
51. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 152.
52. Concerning this motif, cf. → נשׁר *nešer,* §III.2.b.
53. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 223.
54. Contra Fohrer, *Hiob,* 487f.; cf. *BHS.*
55. → ים *yām,* VI, 87-99, esp. §II.3.
56. Cf. Keel, *Symbolism,* 123ff.; A. S. Kapelrud, "The Gates of Hell and the Guardian Angel of Paradise," *JAOS* 18 (1950) 151-56.
57. See III.1 above.

"he covers/shields his feet (with a garment)" *(hāsēḵ 'eṯ-raglāyw),* i.e., he relieves himself.[58] Expressions of this sort hardly attest the existence of a special root *skk* III; the function of covering cannot be distinguished from that of separating off or shielding.

IV. *sukkâ.*

1. *Booth.* The noun *sukkâ,* deriving from *skk,* occurs 30 times in the OT.[59] In approximately half the occurrences, *sukkâ* refers to the "booth" constructed from branches thick with foliage or from reed mats,[60] and once simply to the natural "arbor," "thicket," "covert," as the lair of lions (Job 38:40; cf. **sōḵ,* Jer. 25:38; Ps. 10:9), parallel with *me'ōnâ.*[61] Otherwise the noun is used in connection with the "Feast of Tabernacles" *(ḥag hassukkôṯ).*[62]

According to the OT, the "booth" or "tabernacle" played a varied role in ancient Israel. The basic function of the *sukkâ* was to provide temporary protection (for travelers, nomads, field laborers, soldiers, festival pilgrims, etc.).

A clear illustration of the daily use of a *sukkâ* is found in Isa. 4:5f., transferred into the theological sphere. The passage speaks on the basis of individual elements of the exodus tradition of the absolute protection enjoyed by the congregation of Zion. Here this protection is described (by a glossator?)[63] as follows: "For over all the glory (of Yahweh) will be a canopy *(ḥuppâ),* and a booth *(sukkâ)* for shade by day from the heat and for a refuge *(maḥseh)* and shelter *(mistôr)* from the storm and rain." The two explicative terms *maḥseh* and *mistôr* underscore just this shielding function of the *sukkâ;*[64] so also the par. *ḥuppâ,* which in this text (as in Sir. 40:27) presumably means "canopy," although the meaning "bridal chamber" may also be resonating (cf. Ps. 19:6[5]; Joel 2:16).

The use of a *sukkâ* as a shield against the heat of the sun can also be illustrated in Jon. 4:5. Jonah makes a booth for himself outside Nineveh so he may sit in its shade *(ṣēl;* cf. Isa. 4:6). Protective booths of various sorts are used in connection with daily work. In Isa. 1:8 the daughter Zion is compared with a "booth *(sukkâ)* in a vineyard" and a "nocturnal lodge *(melûnâ)* in a cucumber field." Booths of this sort were erected for those who guarded the fruits of the field against theft.[65] Because of their limited period of use, such booths were naturally constructed somewhat haphazardly, so that the "booth that a watchman makes" *(sukkâ 'āśâ nōṣēr,* Job 27:18)[66] could accordingly serve as a metaphor for the impermanent house of the wicked (in a song about the end

---

58. Cf. Josephus *Ant.* 6.13.4 §§283f.; H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 434.

59. According to *HAL,* II, 754, from *skk* III; see II above.

60. See Alt, 233-42; K.-H. Bernhardt, "Hütte," *BHHW,* II (1964), 754; D. Irvin, "Laubhütte," *BRL*², 202.

61. → מָעוֹן *mā'ôn* (VIII, 449-52). See V below.

62. See IV.2 below.

63. See H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 171-73.

64. → חסה *ḥāsâ* (V, 64-75); → סתר *str.*

65. Cf. *AuS,* II, 55f.; on *melûnâ* cf. Isa. 24:20.

66. Cf. *AuS,* II, 61; IV, 333f.

of the godless). Of course, the *sukkâ* might also be erected as a temporary place of dwelling or safekeeping for livestock *(miqneh),* as evidenced in the geographical-etiological remark concerning Transjordanian Succoth[67] (Gen. 33:17, J?).

The notice in H is also of a cult-etiological nature, namely, that the Feast of Booths[68] is to be celebrated "that your generations may know that I [Yahweh] made the people of Israel dwell in booths *(bassukkôṯ hôšaḇtî)* when I brought them out of the land of Egypt" (Lev. 23:43). Yet this remark also reveals something about the normal use of such booths: they were erected by wanderers and nomads as occasional dwelling places. The entirety of ancient Israelite wilderness traditions, however, militates against this view, since they assert that the wandering Israelites lived in tents.[69]

Such booths were also used in ancient Israelite military camps (cf. also such camps, e.g., in the Egyptian New Kingdom [Egyp. *ỉmȝw*] or the greater Assyrian Empire,[70] as well as in the Syrian camp on Israelite soil [cf. 1 K. 20]). Ben-hadad has a drinking bout with his allies in these "booths" (vv. 12,16). J. Gray's suggestion that this refers to the locale "Succoth" is unlikely in view of, among other factors, v. 1.[71] Ultimately, military camps also include tents (*'ōhᵒlîm,* 2 K. 7:7ff.).

According to 2 S. 10–12, the ark, Israel, and Judah dwelled in booths, while the commander Joab and his servants all camped in the open field (11:11). The sources say nothing about the construction of these booths for such mobilization.

It is not known whether special booths were used for the king in the Israelite military camp, as was the case among neighboring peoples. In any event, during the time of David the ark of Yahweh still constituted the sacral focal point within the camp (cf. 1 S. 4:3ff.), corresponding thus in part to the royal booths among Israel's neighbors. There is no indication whether the booth with the ark of Yahweh was set up outside the camp itself, like the "tent of meeting" *('ōhel mô'ēḏ)* according to the older tradition (Ex. 33:7-11), or inside it, as suggested by the later version (Nu. 2).

The royal booth is also the subject of the otherwise perplexing statement Yahweh makes about the *sukkaṯ dāwîḏ* in Am. 9:11 (as a postinterpretation?):[72] "On that day I will raise up the fallen booth of David, and repair its breaches, raise up its ruins, and I will build it as in days of old." No connection with any Succoth tradition is discernible here,[73] and it is unclear just what is meant concretely by "the fallen booth of David." The reference may be to a restoration of the Davidic dynasty (cf. 2 S. 7:11-16), a rebuilding of the city of David (cf. Isa. 1:8; 58:12), a restitution of the kingdom of Judah, which was persecuted by Edom (cf. Lam. 4:21f.), or even the anticipated reestablishment of the greater Davidic kingdom itself (cf. 2 S. 12:28). What is clear is that this

---

67. See II above.
68. See IV.2 below.
69. → אהל *'ōhel* (I, 118-30); Alt, 241f.
70. Alt, 235-39.
71. *I & II Kings. OTL* (³1977), 423f.
72. Cf. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 350-55.
73. Richardson, 375-81.

booth of David will be "the focal point of the coming global reign of Yahweh,"[74] i.e., a visualization of the royal booth of Yahweh in the midst of the military and cultic community of Israel.

Yahweh's "booth" is also mentioned in connection with a theophany portrayal in the ancient royal thanksgiving psalm Ps. 18 (= 2 S. 22): "He made darkness his covering around him, his booth *(sukkāṯô)* clouds dark with water" (MT v. 12[11]; cf. 2 S. 22:12; the textual emendations suggested by H.-J. Kraus are not compelling; cf. *BHS*): "as the *revelatus* God remains *absconditus*"[75] (cf. Ex. 19:16,18; Ps. 97:2; Ezk. 1:4).

The hymn in Job 36:27–37:13 is similarly cosmological-theophanic in nature. If the reconstruction suggestions of N. H. Torczyner and G. Fohrer are correct, this difficult text is saying: "Can any one understand the spreading of the clouds, the cushioning of his booth" (v. 29), i.e., the clouds serve as the "cushioning" (*taswîṯ,* hapax legomenon) under Yahweh's heavenly booth.[76]

God's otherworldly booth, however, can also descend, especially over Jerusalem's sanctuary and its believers. Thus we read in the (preexilic?) Ps. 27:1-6: "[Yahweh] will hide me in his booth [*beṣukkô,* following *Q,* Aquila, Jerome, Theodotion, Sinaiticus; contra *beṣukkâ* in *K;* cf. LXX^{B}, Symmachus] in the day of trouble; he will conceal me under the cover of his tent *(beṣēṯer 'ohºlô)*" (v. 5). In an evocation of ancient Israelite cultic traditions, the psalmist views the Jerusalem temple as Yahweh's "tent" (*'ōhel;* cf. Ps. 15:1; Lam. 2:6) and "booth" (*sukkâ;* cf. **sōḵ,* Ps. 76:3[2]). In the present context the two terms evoke especially the asylum function of the holy precinct in which Yahweh is the *deus praesens.* This function can also be generalized with reference to Yahweh's protection of the believer, as Ps. 31 suggests: "In the shelter of your presence you hide them [that fear you] from human plots [uncertain: *rōḵes,* hapax legomenon]; you hold them safe in a booth *(beṣukkâ)* from the strife of tongues" (v. 21[20]). Yahweh's shielding booth is defined through the par. *sēṯer,* "cover," "hiding place," "covering."

2. *Feast of Booths.* a. *Introduction.* In the remaining OT contexts the noun *sukkâ* functions in the plural as a *terminus technicus* for the Israelite "Feast of Booths (or Tabernacles)" (*ḥag hassukkôṯ,* Lev. 23:34,42f.; Dt. 16:13,16; 31:10; 2 Ch. 8:13; Ezra 3:4; Neh. 8:15-17; Zec. 14:16,18f.).[77]

The Feast of Booths grew out of the ancient Israelite autumnal festival. In addition to the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex. 23:15; 34:18; cf. Dt. 16:3f.) and the Feast of Weeks (Ex. 34:22; Dt. 16:9-12), this festival is the third and most important "pilgrimage festival" (esp. Dt. 16:13-15);[78] all these festivals were from the very beginning ag-

---

74. Wolff, *Joel and Amos,* 353.
75. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* 255, quotation 260.
76. Torcyzner, *Die Bundeslade und die Anfänge der Religion Israels* (Berlin, ²1930), 26f.; Fohrer, *Hiob,* 480; translation after Fohrer, 478.
77. For an introduction see esp. Kutsch; Cazelles; Aalen; K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 321ff.; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 495-502; Kutsch, Jakobovits, and Kanof; Martin-Achard; Springer; Wilms, 355-71; Bischofberger, Otto, and Mach, 100f., 105f.
78. → חג *ḥag (chagh)* (IV, 201-13).

ricultural festivals, bound to the annual cycle of harvests (cf. *ḥgg*, "turn around"; *ḥwg*, "make a circle"). In addition to New Moon and Sabbath (Ezk. 45:17), the Day of the Trumpet Blasts and the Day of Atonement (Lev. 23:4,24,27), these three main festivals can also be classified according to the more comprehensive term "appointed time" *(mô'ēḏ)*.[79]

Since time immemorial, the autumnal festival/Feast of Booths was the most significant festival in Israel, "*the* festival" (*heḥag*, 1 K. 8:2,65; 12:32; 2 Ch. 5:3; 7:8; Neh. 8:14; Ezk. 45:25) or "the feast of Yahweh" (*ḥag-YHWH*, Lev. 23:39; Jgs. 21:19).[80]

In the oldest commandment tradition, this festival is defined as the "feast of ingathering," i.e., "the harvest festival" *(ḥag hā'āsîp)*, and is associated with the "circuit of the year" (*t^eqûpaṯ haššānâ*, Ex. 34:22) or "the coming forth of the year" (*ṣē'ṯ haššānâ*, Ex. 23:16), i.e., "the beginning of the year" or more likely "the end of the year."[81] This festival was determined apparently by the status of the harvest of wine and fruit trees, or, in the Deuteronomic version, "when you make your ingathering from your threshing floor and your winepress" (Dt. 16:13). Like the Feasts of Unleavened Bread and Weeks, the autumnal festival in Israel was of Canaanite origin (Jgs. 9:27).

Unfortunately, the sparse and often unclear OT sources leave a great many questions unanswered concerning the derivation and character of the ancient Israelite autumnal festival/Feast of Booths. The earlier mentioned connections with the cult of Adonis-Osiris or with the cult of Bacchus at the wine harvest are today discussed only in exceptional instances.[82] Furthermore, derivations from a presumed tent festival among desert nomads or from a reconstructed prestate covenant renewal festival are now considered improbable and unfounded.[83] The main issue is rather the relationship between the autumnal festival and the New Year's Festival. On the basis of older studies, especially P. Volz and S. Mowinckel have advocated the thesis that the ancient Israelite Feast of Booths, which at a later time was celebrated between 15-22 Tishri, was originally the New Year's Feast on 1 Tishri.[84] In analogy to the Mesopotamian *akītu* festival,[85] Mowinckel reconstructed this autumnal New Year's Festival as an Israelite enthronement festival for Yahweh, full of mythical themes and themes associated with sacred history, intended to bring about a renewal of blessings and a change of fate for both human beings and nature.

The English (esp. S. H. Hooke) and Scandinavian schools (e.g., G. Widengren, I. Engnell) further developed Mowinckel's thesis regarding the cult as the most impor-

---

79. See G. Sauer, "יעד *y'd* to appoint," *TLOT*, II, 551-54; → מועד *mô'ēḏ* (VIII, 167-73).

80. See esp. Sauer, "Israels Feste."

81. For the former see *HAL*, II, 426; for the latter see esp. Kutsch, "Von den israelitisch-jüdischen Hauptfesten."

82. Wilms, 356.

83. For the former see H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel* (Eng. trans., Richmond, 1966), 63ff., 132. For the latter see M. Noth, *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (Eng. trans., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972), 59-62; G. von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (Eng. trans., New York, 1966), 33f.

84. De Moor, 5 n. 3; Volz; Mowinckel, 83ff.

85. See Zimmern.

tant institution of Israelite religion, and focused on the mythical aspects of the dying and resurrected god represented by the earthly king. German scholarship has in the meantime emphasized the specifically Israelite elements in the Jerusalem enthronement festival of Yahweh by drawing attention to ancient, pre-Israelite mythologoumena associated with Zion. On the one hand, Yahweh's accession at the conveyance of the ark (Ps. 47) was actualized as the historic date of the Davidic possession of Zion for the blessing of all the world.[86] On the other hand, other aspects could also move to the center of the festival, e.g., the royal festival of Zion celebrating the election of Zion and the dynastic promise (Kraus) or the renewal of the covenant.[87]

Against this identification of the autumnal festival with the New Year's Festival suggested by Volz, Mowinckel, and their successors, others maintain that the ancient Israelite autumnal festival was originally not celebrated on any specific date but rather was determined exclusively by the harvest of wine and fruit, implying the possibility of local variations.[88] As a rule, this view rejects any particular Israelite festival celebration at the beginning of the year. The existence of two New Year's festivals is occasionally assumed, one in the autumn, another in the spring; or one asserts that the preexilic festival on 1 Ethanim has been identified with the postexilic festival on 15 Tishri.[89]

Indeed, the OT sources do not allow any certain resolution of these questions. We do not know whether the preexilic calendar in Israel began in the autumn, or whether the Babylonian calendar was introduced ca. 605 B.C.[90] Hence one cannot determine whether the ancient Israelite autumnal festival/Feast of Booths was identical with the New Year's Festival either locally or generally. It is clear only that this autumnal festival, appropriated from the Canaanites, exhibits numerous points of contact with the Ugaritic New Year's Festival.

b. *Canaanite Autumnal Festival.* The Ugaritic autumnal festival is known to us only from traces within the mythical-epic literature from Ras Shamra. Whereas J. C. de Moor and others find in the myths of the weather god Ba'al-Hadad a description of the seasonal cycle with dry and rainy periods ("seasonal pattern"), and accordingly assert that one can glean a great deal of specific information concerning an autumnal festival as well, others are essentially more cautious.[91] At issue are those texts attesting the

---

86. Otto; Bischofberger, Otto, and Mach; E. Otto and T. Schramm, *Festival and Joy. Biblical Encounter Series* (Eng. trans., Nashville, 1980), 45-78.

87. Weiser; Wilms, 359-401.

88. E.g., L. I. Pap, *Das israelitische Neujahrsfest* (Kampen, 1933), 34-41; J. Ridderbos, "Vierde Oud-Israël een herfst-nieuwzaarsfeest?" *GTT* 57 (1957) 80f.; G. Fohrer, *History of Israelite Religion* (Eng. trans., Nashville, 1972), 203-5.

89. For the former see, e.g., Pap, *Das israelitische Neujahrsfest,* 18-32. For the latter see Snaith, 9ff., 88ff.; H. Cazelles, "Le nouvel an en Israël," *DBS,* VI (1960), 635ff.; A. Caquot, "Remarques sur la fête de la 'néoménie' dans l'ancien Israël," *RHR* 158 (1960) 1-18.

90. Cf. Clines.

91. E.g., C. H. Gordon, "Nunti Personarum et Rerum: Sabbatical Cycle or Season Pattern?" review of A. S. Kapelrud, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts* (Copenhagen, 1952), *Or,* N.S. 22 (1953) 79ff.; H. Gese, *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 68f., 79; J. M. de Tarragon, *Le culte à Ugarit. CahRB* 19 (1980), 17-20, 26; and others.

month expression *r'š yn,* "firstling of the wine."[92] On the first day (new moon) of this month a grape offering is to take place, and on the thirteenth/fourteenth day a royal ritual at a consecrated site. According to de Moor, a location on the temple terrace was assigned to the king as the site for the presentation of the offering and for the purification rites; on this terrace, "four and four dwellings of cut-off foliage" were erected *('r[b'] 'rb' mṯbt zmr).*[93] Although a comparison with the *sukkôṯ* of the Israelites is inviting, it is at the same time hypothetical.

c. *Israelite Autumnal Festival in the Premonarchic Period.* The OT tells us very little about the autumnal festival during the premonarchic period. Neh. 8:17 asserts that the Israelites who had returned from the Babylonian captivity celebrated a festival at the beginning of the seventh month, during which they also made booths *(sukkôṯ)* and dwelt in them, something they "had not done since the days of Jeshua the son of Nun to this day" (cf. 2 K. 23:22; 2 Ch. 30:26; 35:18). This probably represents an attempt to associate the Feast of Booths with the Israelite wilderness tradition as well as to extricate it from the original agricultural, Canaanite autumnal festival.[94]

Jgs. 9:26-29 does indeed attest this Canaanite background, relating that in Shechem the festival was celebrated at the sanctuary after the treading of the grapes and with communal eating and drinking. Jgs. 21:19-21 reveals that the Israelites soon appropriated the Canaanite gathering/treading festival and celebrated it as a "feast of Yahweh"; in Shiloh it was celebrated annually at the wine harvest with a dance of the young girls, i.e., as an autumnal festival. There is no mention of booths, though many of the participants in the joyous autumnal festival may have dwelled in temporary harvest booths. It remains questionable whether the annual pilgrimage festival mentioned in 1 S. 1 has anything to do with the autumnal festival.[95]

d. *Israelite Autumnal Festival during the Monarchy.* During the monarchy the autumnal festival was more closely associated with the Yahweh faith in conscious opposition to the Canaanite Ba'al autumnal festival (cf. Hos. 2:16-25[14-23]) and was institutionalized as one of the three pilgrimage festivals (Ex. 34:18-26; 23:10-19).[96] But especially under Solomon — prepared by David's Zion politics — the autumnal festival at the Jerusalem temple was appropriated with the three-festival cycle and (as a continuation of the Shilonite tradition?) was turned into the main festival (1 K. 9:25). The farmers' thanksgiving harvest festival bound to the agricultural rhythms became a royal festival with a religio-political perspective and with cosmic, in part pan-oriental, elements (1 K. 8:1-13,62-66). Pre-Deuteronomistic 1 K. 8:2 even sets the Solomonic temple consecration within the autumnal festival. The essential character of the regular celebration of this royally oriented autumnal festival at the Solomonic temple is

---

92. *KTU,* 1.41; *UT,* no. 173.
93. De Moor, "Problematical Passages in the Legend of Kirtu (I)," *UF* 14 (1982) 161. See *KTU,* 1.41, 50.
94. J. M. Myers, *Ezra. Nehemiah. AB* 14 (1965), 157.
95. Springer, 18f.; a different view is taken by de Moor, 12.
96. Springer, 29-33; see 2.a above.

strongly disputed.[97] In view of 1 K. 8:1-13, however, several psalms (e.g., 24; 29; 47) can possibly be interpreted within the context of the autumnal festival (processional, theophany and global reign of Yahweh, petition for oracle/priestly torah, blessing, demand for purity, etc.). To be sure, in the period of the greater kingdom the autumnal festival clearly became not only the main festival as such but also a royal festival with a theological signature, i.e., with a confession to the national deity (Yahweh), represented in his earthly king and elected people. After the division of the kingdom, Jeroboam I followed Solomon's politics in employing the autumnal festival to strengthen his own kingship and turned it into a royal festival, albeit not as comprehensively as Solomon (1 K. 12:25-33).

The Deuteronomic festival calendar (Dt. 16:1-15; vv. 16f. are probably secondary)[98] uses the designation "Feast of Booths" (*ḥag hassukkôṯ,* vv. 13,16). Scholars often interpret this as an expression directed against the Jerusalem autumnal festival and associated with the festival customs of local sanctuaries.[99] This is more likely an expression that, while picking up on older calendars (esp. Ex. 34 and 23), seeks to equate the various local autumnal festivals and to define them as pilgrimage festivals, centralizing them then in the sanctuary chosen by Yahweh. In this process, the booth festival is assimilated to the Passover-Unleavened Bread paradigm (by being extended to seven days? v. 13), and the circle of participants is considerably expanded to include also those who are socially dependent and the needy,[100] and the element of festive joy is emphasized. Deuteronomy everywhere associates the exhortation to joy with the Feasts of Weeks and Booths.[101] Above all, however, the three great, originally agricultural festivals are more closely associated with the history of the people of God.[102] It is decisive for the two harvest festivals, however, that according to the Deuteronomic festival theory they are to be celebrated explicitly *l^eYHWH* (vv. 10,15), but not *lipnê YHWH* (cultic formula), and are thus to be distinguished from all other cultic acts.[103] The instructions for a Torah reading during the Feast of Booths, instructions also preserved in the book of Deuteronomy (31:9-13) and conceived as Mosaic in origin, must be viewed as Deuteronomistic or even post-Deuteronomistic,[104] and are presumably to be interpreted from the perspective of the postexilic association between the Feast of Booths–wilderness wanderings (Lev. 23:39-44) and the autumnal festival–Torah reading (Neh. 8:13-18).

e. *Israelite Feast of Booths during the Postexilic Period.* In the exilic or more likely postexilic festival theory within the more recent strata of the draft constitution in Ezk. 40–48,[105] the autumnal festival acquires its special role as "the feast" (*heḥāg,* 45:25).

---

97. See 2.a above.
98. Cf. H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 53.
99. E.g., Bischofberger, Otto, and Hahn, 101.
100. Braulik, "Die Freude des Festes" (1980), 153, 167; (1983), 33, 45.
101. → שׂמח *śāmaḥ;* Braulik, passim.
102. Preuss, *Deuteronomium,* 135.
103. Braulik, "Die Freude des Festes" (1980), 159.
104. Preuss, *Deuteronomium,* 60.
105. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2,* 547-53.

Now, however, the festival is disassociated from the harvest thematic and acquires an atoning function. The festival date is fixed on the fifteenth day of the seventh month (at the beginning of the year in the spring).

This festival date is appropriated by H (Lev. 23:33-36; also yet in Nu. 29:12-38), where the autumnal festival is similarly extricated from the harvest theme (though not in the complementary section Lev. 23:39-44).[106] The seven-day festival first prescribed at the time of cultic centralization (Dt. 16) is maintained (so also Neh. 8; Nu. 29), though its expansion to an eighth day signals its preeminence (as yet in Neh. 8; Nu. 29). The name "Feast of Booths" *(ḥag hassukkôṯ)* is appropriated from Dt. 16. Cessation of work is prescribed (so also Num. 29), and the character of a pilgrimage festival *(ḥag)* is underscored (Dt. 16; Nu. 29). In Lev. 23:33-36, however, the daily fire offering now occupies the central position (cf. Nu. 29; Ezk. 45). The addendum (Lev. 23:39-44) reintegrates the original harvest thematic into the priestly booth festival: "when you have gathered in the produce of the land" (v. 39),[107] and the element of festive joy is emphasized (cf. Dt. 16; Neh. 8). A unique feature within the OT, however, is the interpretation here of the custom of foliage booths with reference to Yahweh's own salvific activity during the exodus, namely, that he had the Israelites dwell "in booths" *(bassukkôṯ);* quite apart from the "tents" of other wilderness traditions, this apparently represents a reference to the divine legitimation of the priestly direction of the festival.[108]

The prescriptions in Nu. 29:12-38 more clearly emphasize the atoning function of the sacrifices belonging to this festival; the number of offerings is more significant than that of the other primary festivals.

Probably somewhat contemporaneous with P, the Chronicler's history deals with the Feast of Booths with approximately the same presuppositions. Neh. 8:13-18, like Lev. 23, emphasizes the element of festive joy, the seven days the community is together, the concluding assembly on the eighth day, and so on. New elements include the zealous attentiveness to the instructions of God associated with the festival (v. 16; see the discussion above concerning Dt. 31:10) and the use of branches of olive, pine (LXX: cypress), myrtle, palm, and of leafy branches (LXX: wild pine branches), all brought in from the hills, to make the booths, "each on his roof, and in his courts" (Neh. 8:16), implying a prescribed, general dwelling in the *sukkâ.* No particular symbolism is attributed to the requirement of specific branches from the Judean hill country. The reference to "the days of Jeshua" is unique.[109] Ezr. 3:4 and 2 Ch. 8:13 retrospectively allude to this association of the postexilic booth festival with the older traditions; the Jews returning from exile were concerned with keeping the prescribed festivals, even before the rebuilding of the temple (Ezr. 3:4).[110] From the consecration

106. Concerning the literary criticism of this passage, cf. K. Elliger, *Leviticus,* 302-24.
107. Concerning additional concrete features, cf. Elliger, *Leviticus,* 322.
108. Springer, 83f.
109. See 2.a above.
110. W. Rudolph, *Esra und Nehemia samt 3. Esra. HAT* XX (1949), 30.

of the first temple onward, King Solomon already sacrificed at the Feast of Booths according to the Mosaic law (2 Ch. 8:13).

Among the OT texts of the later period, only Zec. 14:16-21 expressly mentions the Feast of Booths (after 333? cf. somewhat earlier Isa. 66:18-24; Hag. 2:1-9), though it does not include any instructions for the external disposition of the festival. Whereas Lev. 23:42 excludes non-Israelites from the festival, Zec. 14 prophetically anticipates an annual pilgrimage of the nations to Jerusalem for the Feast of Booths: "Every one that survives of all the nations that have come against Jerusalem shall go up year after year to worship the King, Yahweh of hosts, and to keep the feast of booths" (*weʼlāḥōg ʼeṯ-ḥag hassukkôṯ,* v. 16). Here the Feast of Booths becomes a universal affair (concerning the motif of a pilgrimage of the nations, cf. Isa. 66:18-22; further also Isa. 2:3-4; 60; Mic. 4:1; Hag. 2:1-9); under the threat of harsh punishment, all the nations are to come to Jerusalem, albeit not to deal with general religious and political matters within the framework of the autumnal festival (cf. Jgs. 9:26-29; 1 K. 8:1-13; 2 K. 23:1-3), but rather to pay homage to the king, Yahweh, the world ruler. This text reveals that an element of competition existed at this time between the diaspora cultic sites and the temple in Jerusalem, and that certain Jerusalem circles wanted to turn this voluntary pilgrimage of the nations into an imposed tribute obligation.[111]

During the Hellenistic-Roman period the Feast of Booths preserved its older, predominant position in the festival calendar; it was "the most holy and greatest festival among the Hebrews"[112] (cf. 2 Mc. 10:1-8). The original fertility thematic also reasserted itself (libations on the altar, processional around the altar, waving of the festival bouquet, erection and beating of the willow on the seventh day, etc.).[113] The NT also attests the significance of the festival in ancient Judaism.[114] The rabbinic regulations and discussions concerning the Feast of Booths are concentrated above all in the great halakic works of tradition in the tractate *Sukka (Seder Moʽed).*[115]

V. **mesuḵâ, *sāḵ, *sōḵ,* and *sōḵēḵ*. The remaining derivatives of the root *skk* play no theologically significant role in the OT.

The hapax legomenon **mesuḵâ* (Ezk. 28:13) functions apparently in the manner of a keyword anticipating the ensuing *kerûḇ hassôḵēḵ* (vv. 14,16);[116] "the shielding/covering *(hassôḵēḵ)*" cherub — the king of Tyre — was himself a miraculously "covered" one: "Every precious stone was your garment/covering."[117]

The term **saḵ* is also a hapax legomenon in the OT (Ps. 42:5[4]). In light of the par.

111. De Moor, 28; Springer, 101-4.

112. Josephus *Ant.* 8.4.1 §100.

113. D. Flusser, "Ḥag hassukôṯ babbayiṯ haššēnî," *Maḥanayim* 50 (1960/61) 28-30; Safrai; Bischofberger, Otto, and Mach, 110; bibliog., 114f.

114. K. Hruby, "La fête des Tabernacles aux Temple, à la synagogue et dans le N.T.," *L'Orient Syrien* 7/2 (1962) 163-74; W. Michaelis, "σκηνή κτλ.," *TDNT,* VII, 368-94.

115. Cf. St.-B., II, 774-812; Fabricant; Gaster; Kutsch, Jakobovitz, and Kanof; Snaith; Zevin.

116. See III.1.

117. On the various interpretations attempted by the ancient versions, cf. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2,* 82f.

*bêṯ *ᵉ*lōhîm,* this is either to be vocalized as *sōḵ* or otherwise viewed as an equivalent (cf. LXX, Sinaiticus). The accompanying *'eddaddēm* ("I led in procession") is more probably to be read as the divine predicate *'addîr* (cf. the LXX).[118] In this (preexilic?) prayer the singer is thus recalling how he once "entered the booth of Yahweh," i.e., into the temple (cf. 5:12[11]; 27:5; 31:21[20]; 91:4).[119]

The noun **sōḵ* is semantically and functionally related to *sukkâ.* It refers to the natural "canopy" or "thicket" that serves as the lion's lair (cf. *sukkâ* in Job 38:40). The (postexilic?) hymn and petition Pss. 9–10 says that the wicked "lurks in secret like a lion in his thicket" (10:9); and a postexilic interpretation of Jer. 25:34-37 is presumably describing Nebuchadnezzar as a lion that has left his thicket and is now devastating the Judean countryside (v. 38 according to W. Rudolph:[120] according to the MT the lion is Yahweh himself!). Otherwise, this noun refers to the Jerusalem sanctuary as Yahweh's "tabernacle," whereby "ancient sanctuary traditions of Israel's premonarchy period are transferred to the sanctuary founded by David"[121] (cf. *sukkâ* in Ps. 27:5). Thus the Zion hymn Ps. 76 reads: "His tabernacle *(sukkô)* has been established in Salem, his dwelling place *(mᵉ'ônāṯô)* in Zion" (v. 3[2]). The same notion is found in Lam. 2, imitating a dirge (if one follows the many mss. that read *sukkô* instead of MT *śukkô*): Yahweh "has destroyed his booth like a garden [LXX: like a vine]" (v. 6).[122]

The hapax legomenon *sōḵēḵ* occurs in Nah. 2:6(5).[123] The enemy assault is described: "They hasten to the wall, the mantelet *(hassōḵēḵ)* is set up"[124] (cf. *hassōḵēḵ* with a different meaning in Ezk. 28:14,16).

VI. LXX. The LXX usually understands the verb *skk* to mean "cover," "overshadow," etc., though its renderings can vary widely (e.g., *dia-/epi-/sy-/skiázein; dia-/epi-/skepázein; perikalýptein; kataskēnoún*). The noun *sukkâ* is rendered 26 times with *skēnḗ* (otherwise, e.g., with *skēnopēgía/eía; skḗnōma*); **sōḵ* is rendered, e.g., with *skēnḗ* and *katályma.*

VII. Qumran. In Qumran the festival ordinance of Lev. 23 and Nu. 29, authoritative also for the postexilic community, was maintained. This emerges from a festival calendar published by J. T. Milik.[125] This calendar, representing a pure solar calendar of 364 days (like Jubilees; 1 Enoch), stipulates a weekday for each festival. On Wednesday, the fifteenth day of the seventh month, the cycle of festivals is concluded

118. On Ps. 42:5(4) see Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* 435-37.

119. On the last two texts see IV.1 and III.4, respectively.

120. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* XII (³1968), 166-68.

121. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150,* 109; see also IV.1 above.

122. For alternative interpretations see W. Rudolph, *Die Klagelieder. KAT* XVII/2 (1962), 219; on **sōḵ* in Ps. 27:5 *Q,* see IV.1 above; on the conj. in Job 20:22, see III.1 above; on the conj. in Ps. 42:5(4), see above.

123. *KBL*², 712b, incorrectly as Neh. 2:6; corrected in *HAL,* II, 754.

124. Benzinger, 310; III.1 above.

125. "Le travail d'édition des mss. du désert de Juda," *Congress Volume, Strasbourg 1956. SVT* 4 (1957), 25; cf. E. Vogt, "Kalenderfragmente aus Qumran," *Bibl* 39 (1958) 72-77.

with the Feast of Booths. That this is mentioned as the last festival indicates that the year commenced in the spring (with Passover as the first festival; cf. Ex. 12:2). Both the date and the name of the booth festival *(ḥg hskwt)* are the same as in Lev. 23:34. The calendar says nothing about the actual celebration of this festival in the Qumran community, though the Temple Scroll does provide regulations for the Feast of Booths (11QT 27:10-29, 2/3; cf. 11:13; 42:10ff.; 44:6ff.).[126] In comparison with Lev. 23:33-36, Nu. 29:12-38, and Ezk. 45:25, these texts do not contain anything new except for the Temple Scroll's characteristic preference for the sin offering over the burnt offering.[127]

The interpretation of *sikkûṯ* (Am. 5:26) in CD 7:14-17 is of interest from an exegetical perspective. The context involves those who held fast and escaped to the land of the north (i.e., into the area of Damascus), with a reference to Am. 5:26f., "I will exile Sikkuth, your king, and Kiyyun, your statue, beyond the tents of Damascus"; and Am. 9:11, "the books of the law are the booth of the king *(swkt hmlk),* as (the prophet) said: and I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen. The *king* is the congregation." Here "Sikkuth" becomes "booth" *(sukkâ),* and "king" *(meleḵ)* becomes "congregation" *(qāhāl).* The background to this exegesis is found in the OT association between the (Feast of) Booth(s) and the wilderness/Sinai tradition.[128] "With the help of Am. 9:11, the exile of the Torah (and of the congregation) is interpreted as a raising up of the law. The congregation receives . . . messianic features. It understands its exile as a salvific exile, and the Torah as the space granted to it for its existence during this exile."[129] The citation from Am. 9:11 also occurs in 4QFlor 1:12f., which is interpreted eschatologically/messianically with reference to the interpreter of the law who will appear in Zion at the end of days: "This is the booth of David that is fallen, which will stand in order to deliver Israel." Finally, in the sabbath regulations in CD 11:8f. we read that if on the sabbath a person "is in a booth *(bswkh),* let him neither take anything out nor bring anything in."

Kronholm

126. Haag, 127f., 132. See Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll,* 4 vols. (Eng. trans., Jerusalem, 1983), I, 108f.

127. J. Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Intro., Translation, and Comm. JSOTSup* 34 (Eng. trans. 1985), 85f.

128. See IV.2 above.

129. P. von der Osten-Sacken, "Die Bücher der Tora als Hütte der Gemeinde," *ZAW* 91 (1979) 422-35, esp. 435.

סכל *skl;* סָכָל *sāḵāl;* סִכְלוּת *siḵlûṯ;* סֶכֶל *seḵel*

Contents: I. Etymology, Extrabiblical Occurrences. II. 1. Biblical Occurrences; 2. LXX. III. Meaning. IV. Qumran.

I. Etymology, Extrabiblical Occurrences. The root *skl* is attested in pre-OT texts only in Akkadian as the adj. *saklu,* "simpleminded, dull, foolish," a term that according to the evidence of several kudurrus is applied to a person whose intellectual shortcomings preclude any correct estimation of his own actions and their consequences.[1] This corresponds in Hebrew to → כסל *ksl*[2] and *skl.* Based on the Akkadian sequence of consonants, one should not assume a metathetical formation of *skl* from *ksl.*[3] F. Delitzsch postulates a verb *sāḵal,* "which signifies 'to twist together, . . .' and is referred partly to a complication and partly to a confusion of ideas."[4] This might be indicated by the Arabic verb he adduces, *šakela,* "hobble, be dubious," which can also be associated with *śkl* II, "lay crosswise."[5]

Since *KTU* 3.1.38 is to be read as *skn* instead of *skl,*[6] and the only Aramaic occurrence in Ahiqar 147 is usually not translated as "be foolish,"[7] but rather in the sense of the Hebrew root *śkl* I, "have understanding, insight,"[8] the only reference remaining is that to the appropriation of *skl* into Jewish Aramaic, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Syriac, and Mandaic, where the verb has the meaning "act foolishly, sin," and except in Mandaic[9] coincides graphically with *śkl* I.

II. 1. *Biblical Occurrences.* Of the 23 occurrences of the root *skl* in the OT, 8 involve the verb (niphal 4 times; piel and hiphil twice each), distributed in 1-2 Samuel (4

---

skl. T. Donald, "The Semantic Field of 'Folly' in Proverbs, Job, Psalms, and Ecclesiastes," *VT* 13 (1963) 285-92; M. Held, "Studies in Comparative Semitic Lexicography," *Studies in Honor of B. Landsberger. AS* 16 (1965), 395-406; S. A. Mandry, "There Is No God! A Study of the Fool in the OT, Particularly in Proverbs and Qohelet" (diss., Pontifical University, Rome, 1972); W. M. W. Roth, "A Study of the Classical Hebrew Verb ṢKL," *VT* 18 (1968) 69-78; G. Vos, "Fool," *HDB,* II, 43f.

1. *AHw,* II, 1012; R. Borger, "Vier Grenzsteinurkunden Merodachbaladans I von Babylonien. Der Teheran-Kudurru, SB 33, SB 169, SB 26," *AfO* 23 (1970) 2, II 8f.; 14, II 15ff.

2. B. Landsberger, *Brief des Bischofs von Esagila an König Asarhaddon. Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen. Afd. Letterkunde,* Nieuwe reeks 28/6 (Amsterdam, 1965), 61 n. 114; Held, 406.

3. Contra Vos, 43; cf. Roth, 78 n. 1.

4. F. Delitzsch, *Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes. KD* (1950), 238.

5. Wehr, 563f.; cf. *HAL,* II, 754; *GesB,* 786.

6. Whitaker, 464.

7. With A. Ungnad: W. Baumgartner, "Das Aramäische im Buche Daniel," *ZAW* 45 (1927) 102.

8. M. Sæbø, "שׂכל *śkl* hi. to have insight," *TLOT,* III, 1270-71; *DNSI,* II, 785.

9. *MdD,* 312.

times), 1-2 Chronicles (twice), Gen. 31:28, and Isa. 44:25 (*śkl* = *skl*).[10] The adj. *sāḵal* (7 occurrences) as well as the subst. *siḵlûṯ* (7 occurrences; Eccl. 1:17: *śiḵlûṯ* = *siḵlûṯ*)[11] are favorite words of Ecclesiastes, and with the exception of 2 occurrences of *sāḵal* in Jeremiah occur only there. Some scholars conjecture *śkl* = *skl* piel in Job 12:17.[12] Outside the Hebrew canon, the adjective occurs in Sir. 51:23.

2. *LXX.* The LXX translates the verb inconsistently with *mataióomai, mōraínō,*[13] *diaskédō, agnoéō,* and *aphrónōs (prắttō).* The adjective and noun are usually rendered with *áphrōn* or *aphrosýnē,* excepting Jer. 5:21 *(mōrós),* Eccl. 7:17 *(sklērós),* and 7:25 *(sklēría).*

III. Meaning.

1. *Verb.* The semantic content of the verb can be grouped according to the three stems. The piel *sikkēl* aims at the disqualification of that which human *ratio* produces, as shown clearly by its association with the objects *'ēṣâ* (2 S. 15:31) and *da'aṯ* (Isa. 44:25, par. with *'ēṣâ* in v. 26). Hence in 2 S. 15:31 David petitions Yahweh to "turn the counsel of Ahithophel into foolishness." It is disputed whether the verse is redactional and is intended to disdain Ahithophel's first counsel (16:21ff.) as being contrary to the ancient Israelite ethos and hence "foolish" in an "essentially if not exclusively religious and moral sense,"[14] or whether 15:31 belongs to the older basic stratum and represents a request for an "inappropriate" plan that is fulfilled in 17:14a with the acceptance of the better *(ṭôḇ)* plan of Hushai.[15] A translation of *skl* in 15:31 with "frustrate" is to be rejected, since *sikkēl* refers to the quality rather than to the realization of such counsel.[16] This is confirmed by Isa. 44:25, where Yahweh relates that he makes "foolish" the knowledge of the wise, thus causing their counsel to be "useless as far as appropriate behavior is concerned."[17]

The hiphil *hiskîl* characterizes as a faulty decision any concrete act that itself acquires the character of culpability in view of the consequences for those affected, consequences of which the "perpetrator" is not yet aware at the moment of such action.[18] In Gen. 31:28 (E), Laban can accuse Jacob of having acted "foolishly" *('attâ hiskaltā*

---

10. Cf. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja,* part 1, *40,1–45,7. BK* XI/1 (1978), 454; *HAL,* II, 754.

11. Cf. *BHS;* A. Lauha, *Kohelet. BK* XIX (1978), 41; a different reading is found in the LXX: *epistḗmē;* K. Galling, *Der Prediger. HAT* XVIII (^{2}1969), 87; Eccl. 10:13 according to *BHK.*

12. E.g., G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 237; a different view is taken by F. Horst, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten. BK* XIV (^{3}1964), 180.

13. On 2 S. 24:10 see G. Bertram, "μωρός κτλ.," *TDNT,* IV, 835.

14. See F. Langlamet, "Absalom et les concubines de son père: recherches sur II Sam., XVI, 21-22," *RB* 84 (1977) 161-209, esp. 195f.; E. Würthwein, "Die Erzählung von der Thronfolge Davids — theologische oder politische Geschichtsschreibung?" *ThS* 115 (1974) 37ff.

15. Cf., e.g., J. Kegler, *Politisches Geschehen und theologisches Verstehen* (Stuttgart, 1977), 179f.; Roth, 72; Langlamet, *RB* 84 (1977) 185 n. 69.

16. Contra *HAL,* II, 754.

17. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja,* 469.

18. H. J. Stoebe, *Das 1. Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 465.

ʿaśô)[19] because through his flight Jacob has slighted the usual customs of farewell (cf. Gen. 32:1[Eng. 31:55]). C. Mabee identifies Jacob's omission in the fact that he did not officially allow Laban to transfer to him authority over the latter's daughters.[20] In 1 S. 26:21 Saul acknowledges that his persecution of David was a faulty decision, but at the same time excuses it as a result of human error.[21]

The niphal *niskal*, unattested in preexilic texts, emphasizes through its reflexive aspect the element of excessive confidence in oneself and in the correctness of one's own decisions as the root of foolish behavior. It is used in connection with the prophetic reproach of a king who has acted willfully and against the will of Yahweh (1 S. 13:13 DtrN), or who trusts more in human allies than in God (2 Ch. 16:9): by taking the census, David has incurred guilt *(ʿāwôn)* and "acted very foolishly" (2 S. 24:10 DtrP = 1 Ch. 21:8).[22] The folly of the various faulty decisions is always that at the moment of decision, the person (here always the king) is not aware that he is deciding against Yahweh, and thus does not anticipate the consequences of his actions, namely, Yahweh's chastisement. This folly is all the more grievous because this chastisement is never directed at the king himself. Rather, he must accept responsibility for a disaster that ultimately overtakes the innocent. Hence *niskal* oscillates between "act foolishly" and "sin."

2. *Adjective and Noun.* Jer. 5:21-25 emphasizes the willful aspect of such decisions against God much more strongly. Here the adj. *sāḵal* is applied to the people, who despite the evidence of God in creation nonetheless look past God (v. 21) and are apparently unaware of the chastising consequences of their denial (cf. v. 25). Jer. 4:22 equates folly (*sāḵal*, par. → אויל *ʾewîl*, antonym → בין *bîn*, niphal) and an incapacity for the good, a disposition emerging from inadequate knowledge of God.[23]

Eccl. 7:17 similarly juxtaposes *ršʿ* and *hāyâ sāḵal* (cf. also *siḵlûṯ* in Eccl. 7:25), commensurate with the ancient wisdom teaching according to which a person who does not hold to the law will die prematurely. Further, *siḵlûṯ*, "ignorance," is contrasted with *ḥoḵmâ* as that particular knowledge and ability which can be turned into technological advantage or personal power, and that particular training which confers social status (cf. Eccl. 1:17; 2:3,12f.; also 2:19).[24] The threefold parallel between *siḵlûṯ* and *hôlēlôṯ*[25] is striking, and even occurs again in 10:13. In this chapter Ecclesiastes uses the substantive (vv. 1,13) and adjective (vv. 3,14) in condemning human stupidity lacking in any rational basis and self-understanding, stupidity that simply prattles on thoughtlessly. To the extent that education was a prerogative of the wealthy during the

---

19. On this construction see JM, II, §124n n. 1; *Synt.*, 93k.
20. "Jacob and Laban: The Structure of Judicial Proceedings (Genesis xxxi 25-42)," *VT* 30 (1980) 192-207.
21. On *šgh* cf. G. Quell, "ἁμαρτάνω," *TDNT*, I, 274f.; → שגה *šāgâ*.
22. For a discussion of the census, cf. W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* XXI (1955), 143f.
23. → טוב *ṭôḇ*, V, 309f.
24. Cf. N. Lohfink, *Kohelet. NEB* (1980), 24.
25. → הלל *hll*, III, 411-13.

time of Ecclesiastes, he is able to contrast the stupid and uneducated (10:6, *seḵel,* referring the abstract through the concrete) with the rich *(ʿāšîr).*[26] These texts do not support the assertion that the root *skl* here and in the other passages in Ecclesiastes refers to avarice and a striving for power.[27]

A lack of wisdom in the sense of a knowledge of life characterizes the *s*ᵉ*ḵālîm (apaídeutoi)* in Sir. 51:23, whom the wisdom teacher advises to attend the house of instruction.

IV. Qumran. The Qumran literature once attests the noun *siḵlûṯ* (1QS 7:14): "Whoever has guffawed foolishly shall do penance for thirty days." The noun (Aram.) *skl,* "fool," occurs in 11QtgJob 5:2.

Fleischer

---

26. See Lohfink, *Kohelet,* 75; M. Dahood, "The Phoenician Background of Qoheleth," *Bibl* 47 (1966) 278; → עשׁר *ʿāšar.*
27. Contra Mandry, 83f.

סָלַח *sālaḥ;* סַלָּח *sallāḥ;* סְלִיחָה *s*ᵉ*lîḥâ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT Usage: 1. Denial of Forgiveness; 2. Granting of Forgiveness; 3. Yahweh's Willingness to Forgive; 4. Plea for Forgiveness. III. Sirach and Qumran. IV. LXX.

---

sālaḥ. S. Böhmer, *Heimkehr und neuer Bund. GTA* 5 (1976), 74-79; R. Bultmann, "ἀφίημι," *TDNT,* I, 509-12; D. Daube, *Sin, Ignorance and Forgiveness in the Bible* (London, 1960); W. Eichrodt, "Sin and Forgiveness," *Theology of the OT,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1961-67), II, 380-495; C. Göbel, "'Denn bei dir ist die Vergebung' — *slḥ* im AT," *ThV* 8 (1977) 21-33; A. H. J. Gunneweg, "Schuld ohne Vergebung?" *EvT* 36 (1976) 2-14; G. F. Hasel, "Health and Healing in the OT," *AUSS* 21 (1983) 191-202; S. Herner, *Sühne und Vergebung in Israel* (Lund, 1942); B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. WMANT* 55 (1982); B. Kedar, *Biblische Semantik* (Stuttgart, 1981), 107f.; J. Köberle, *Sünde und Gnade im religiösen Leben des Volkes Israel bis auf Christum* (Munich, 1905); L. Köhler, *OT Theology* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1957), 217f.; K. Koch, "Sühne und Sündenvergebung um die Wende von der exilischen zur nachexilischen Zeit," *EvT* 26 (1966) 217-39; C. Levin, *Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt. FRLANT* 137 (1985); M. McKeating, "Divine Forgiveness in the Psalms," *SJT* 18 (1965) 69-83; K. D. Sakenfeld, "The Problem of Divine Forgiveness in Numbers 14," *CBQ* 37 (1975) 317-30; A. Schenker, *Versöhnung und Sühne. BibB* 15 (1981); J. J. Stamm, *Erlösen und Vergeben im AT* (Bern, 1940); idem, "סלח *slḥ* to forgive," *TLOT,* II, 797-803; C.-H. Sung, "Sündenvergebung Jesu bei den Synoptikern und seine Voraussetzungen im AT und frühen Judentum" (diss., Tübingen, 1984); W. Thiel, *Die*

I. Etymology. Outside Hebrew, the root *slḥ* occurs in Arabic as *slḫ* in the sense of "strip off," in Syrian Arabic in the meaning "impose a ransom," and in Middle Hebrew, Jewish Aramaic, and Samaritan as "pardon." Akk. *salāḫu(m)* probably represents the original, concrete meaning of the verb: "asperse, sprinkle," mentioning water and oil as well as urine and tears as the means of aspersion.[1] Objects can also include cultic utensils. Differently than in Hebrew, the root *slḥ* is used in Akkadian especially in non-religious contexts.[2]

Ugarit attests the expression *slḫ npš* within a ritual text in which J. Gray finds evidence of "the Canaanite counterpart to the Hebrew Day of Atonement," and accordingly translates "forgiveness of the soul."[3] The uncertain context, however, precludes any unequivocal understanding of this expression.[4] Thus both C. H. Gordon, who refers to the Akkadian, and Gray, who refers to Arab. *slḫ*, suggest other translation possibilities with "asperse, sprinkle" or "unclothe," "come to an end."[5]

The root *zlḥ*, probably deriving also from *slḥ*, similarly occurs in the sense of "asperse, sprinkle," in Middle Hebrew, Jewish Aramaic, Syriac, and Mandaic, as well as in Ethiopic as *zalḥa* with the meaning "draw [e.g., water; *haurire, exhaurire*]."[6]

II. OT Usage. In the OT the root *slḥ* occurs with the meaning "forgiveness of sin" (often in connection with → פשׁע *pšʿ* and → חטא *ḥṭʾ*) 46 times as a verb, 33 of those in the qal and 13 in the niphal, once as the verbal adj. *sallāḥ* (Ps. 86:5), and 3 times as the subst. *seliḥâ* (Neh. 9:17; Ps. 130:4; Dnl. 9:9). Almost all these occurrences can be dated to the exilic-postexilic period. It is striking that there is no evidence of secular use. Rather, the one who grants *slḥ* is consistently Yahweh, and *slḥ* is not used in reference to forgiveness among human beings. The evidence for this root can be summarized according to the following main areas of use: denial of forgiveness, granting of forgiveness, Yahweh's willingness to forgive, plea for forgiveness.

1. *Denial of Forgiveness.* The root *slḥ* is used only rarely within the OT in connection with the denial of forgiveness (Dt. 29:19[Eng. v. 20]; 2 K. 24:4; Jer. 5:7; Lam. 3:42 — all [early] exilic texts). Dt. 29:19(20), which like Dt. 29 as a whole derives from a context of "early theological examination of Israel's guilt in correspondence with

---

deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45. WMANT 52 (1981), 26; H. Thyen, *Studien zur Sündenvergebung. FRLANT* 96 (1970); F. E. Wilms, "Du bist ein Gott voller Vergebung (Neh 9,17): Gedanken über Sühne und Versöhnung im AT," *LebZeug* 30 (1975) 5-21; for further bibliog. see *TWNT,* X/2, 996-97; → כפר *kipper.*

1. *AHw,* II, 1013.
2. For specifics see Stamm, *Erlösen und Vergeben,* 57f.
3. Gray, *The Legacy of Canaan. SVT* 5 (^{2}1965), 193; see *KTU,* 1.46. Cf. C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature. SPIB* 98 (1949), 113.
4. Cf. M. Dahood, *Psalms 51–100. AB* 17 (1968), 293.
5. Gordon, *UT,* no. 1757; Gray, "Social Aspects of Canaanite Religion," *Congress Volume, Geneva 1965. SVT* 15 (1966), 191. Cf. Stamm, *TLOT,* II, 797-98; concerning the name *yslḥ* occurring in the Elephantine papyri, see ibid., 798.
6. *LexLingAeth,* 1034.

Yahweh's pardoning,"[7] rejects forgiveness (as does also Jer. 5:7) whenever the guilt consists in having followed foreign gods. Similarly, neither does Lam. 3:42 countenance forgiveness, since the people have fallen away from Yahweh. According to 2 K. 24:4, Yahweh denies forgiveness because the blood of innocent people has been shed through Manasseh. Both Dt. 29:19(20) and 2 K. 24:4 not only confirm that forgiveness is not granted but also emphasize that Yahweh does not have the will to *slḥ (lō' + 'āḇâ).*

2. *Granting of Forgiveness.* The granting of forgiveness is found especially in cultic texts. One such focal point includes the prescriptions for sin and guilt offerings in Lev. 4 and 5 (4:20,26,31,35; 5:10,13,16,18,26[6:7]). Except for 5:26(6:7), this always involves the forgiveness of sins committed inadvertently and unconsciously, of which the culpable person becomes aware only later. Lev. 4:20 assures the forgiveness of the entire congregation of Israel for some indeterminate guilt following a completed sacrificial rite, while the following passages involve individuals. Lev. 4:26 grants *slḥ* to the prince for unconscious transgression against a commandment of Yahweh, and vv. 31,35 refer to an undetermined member of the people, again in view of a transgression against a divine commandment not qualified more specifically.

Lev. 5:1ff. regulates the possibility of atonement for an error consisting in one of the people failing to report an overheard curse, touching something unclean, or uttering a rash oath. V. 16 assures forgiveness, following the appropriate atonement rite, to the person who inadvertently transgresses regarding objects consecrated to Yahweh, and v. 18 once more addresses in a general fashion the question of forgiveness for the person who has inadvertently transgressed against one of Yahweh's commandments. According to vv. 20-26(6:1-7), forgiveness is also possible for the person who transgresses with regard to another's property, providing the corresponding atonement rite is carried out by the priest. Lev. 19:20-22 regulates the case of a man who lies with a female slave who has not yet been freed. He, too, is forgiven following the performance of the atonement rite.

Nu. 15:22ff. offers the possibility of forgiveness after a corresponding rite if one of the offerings mentioned in vv. 1ff. is inadvertently omitted. This forgiveness is granted to the entire congregation as well as to the sojourner within it (vv. 25f.), though it also applies to the individual who inadvertently sins (v. 28).[8]

The feature common to all these texts is that the requisite atonement rite is performed by the priest, whereby the verb → כפר *kpr* variously plays a role.[9] Each individual case concludes with the formula *wᵉnislaḥ lô* or *lāhem.* That is, *slḥ* is used in the niphal, so that no direct subject is specified for the verb. Based on the use of this root elsewhere, however, one may conclude that here, too, the subject of this forgiveness is Yahweh. In this connection the priest possibly functions to grant this forgiveness in the

---

7. Following L. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im AT. WMANT* 36 (1969), 23.

8. On the relationship betwen Nu. 15:22ff. and Lev. 4, cf. D. Kellermann, "Bemerkungen zum Sündopfergesetz in Num 15,22ff.," *Wort und Geschichte. FS K. Elliger. AOAT* 18 (1973), 107-13.

9. Cf. Janowski.

form of a declarative formula, though this formula cannot be directly reconstructed here. The formula actually occurring in the individual passages does not itself exhibit any declarative features.[10]

Nu. 30:6,9,13(5,8,12), the only passages representing "casuistically formulated sacral law,"[11] also point in a direction similar to that of the previous texts. Each involves a woman's failure to keep a vow.[12] In contradistinction to the previous passages, however, this vow is *consciously* broken. Yahweh will, however, yet grant forgiveness if the reason was actually her father's opposition (v. 6[5]) or her husband's objection (v. 9[8]), or if the latter nullifies the vow (v. 13[12]). Hence in the final analysis the woman's guilt does ultimately become unintentional. An atonement rite is not required in these cases.

Apart from these passages within the context of the Priestly source, such granting of forgiveness is found in a higher concentration in the book of Jeremiah (Jer. 5:1; 31:34; 33:8; 36:3; 50:20). These passages focus on the people itself, with the exception of Jer. 33:8, though even there a collective is again addressed, namely, Jerusalem. A recollection of Gen. 18:22ff. is found in Jer. 5:1, probably an authentic Jeremianic verse according to which Yahweh is prepared to forgive *('eslaḥ)* the community/Judah if a person can be found who does justice.[13] Hence one discerns a fundamental willingness on Yahweh's part to grant forgiveness, even though the possibility of its realization is not necessarily given (v. 7). On the basis of the experience of the exile, the Deuteronomistic text Jer. 31:31ff. presents forgiveness as the basis of the new relationship with God.[14] When Yahweh makes the new covenant with Israel, knowledge of Yahweh will stand in the foreground because he will forgive their guilt and no longer remember their sins *('eslaḥ laᵃwōnām ûlᵉḥaṭṭā'ṯām lō' 'ezkor-'ôḏ)*. As a result of this forgiveness, then, the guilt now separating the people from Yahweh no longer plays a role; rather, a *new* relationship is possible without any consideration of guilt.

A similar promise of forgiveness is found in the post-Deuteronomistic chapter Jer. 33.[15] Yahweh will turn the fate of Israel and Judah, cleanse them of their guilt, and forgive their sin (*wᵉsālaḥtî*, 33:8). "The forgiveness of guilt is the presupposition for the granting of salvation."[16] Yet another Deuteronomistic passage, Jer. 36:3, expresses the hope that Judah will turn from its evil path so that Yahweh can forgive it *(wᵉsālaḥtî)*. Jer. 50:20 picks up 31:31-34 with the assurance that after the fall of Babylon, the iniquity of Israel and Judah will be sought in vain, because Yahweh will forgive *('eslaḥ)* those whom he leaves as a remnant. That is, forgiveness is understood here clearly in the sense of an extinguishing or elimination of guilt, so that "Israel's future would be

---

10. Cf. Göbel, 24, however, who postulates a declarative formula here as well as a connection with the notion of *ex opere operato*.

11. Göbel, 24.

12. → נדר *nāḏar* (IX, 242-55).

13. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25*. *WMANT* 41 (1973), 120.

14. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45*, 26; Böhmer, 74ff.

15. Thiel, *Jeremia 26–45*, 37.

16. J. Schreiner, *Jeremia II, 25,15–52,34*. *NEB* 9 (1984), 197.

one of perfect harmony with God, when never again would rebellion and sin separate her from him."[17]

According to Nu. 14:20, forgiveness does not preclude punishment. As a result of Moses' intercession, Yahweh will indeed forgive the people for their apostasy but will not suspend punishment (vv. 21ff.), though the text does not indicate wherein this forgiveness will become visible. This is not the case in the Chronicler's version of Yahweh's response to the temple consecration under Solomon (2 Ch. 7:12ff.), in which forgiveness is granted under the condition of repentance (v. 14 — with no parallel in 1 K. 9:2-9). After they turn from their evil ways, Yahweh will forgive the people (*'eslaḥ*) and heal their land. According to this view, forgiveness manifests itself in concrete acts, in this case in the reestablishment of the previously devastated land.

3. *Yahweh's Willingness to Forgive.* Yahweh's willingness to forgive is more prominent in prayer texts. Hence in his great petitionary prayer (Neh. 9), Nehemiah recalls the experience of Yahweh in history and reminds Yahweh (v. 17) how despite constant apostasy he did not completely give up on Israel: "For you are a God of forgiveness" (*w^e'attâ 'ᵉlôah s^elîḥôṯ*). The term *s^elîḥôṯ* represents the sum of all these positive experiences. "Thus it refers to Yahweh's ever renewed love for his people — grounded in his innermost being."[18] The prayer in Dnl. 9 similarly recalls Yahweh's forgiveness, again with the pl. subst. *s^elîḥôṯ* in v. 9. Yahweh's forgiveness is contrasted with the people's apostasy, and then v. 19 refers once again, through its plea *s^elāḥâ,* to Yahweh's willingness to forgive. Here, too, reference to *slḥ* is associated with suspension of guilt and the resulting distress.

While Ps. 25:11 implores forgiveness, 86:5; 103:3; and 130:4 focus more on addressing forgiveness as a characteristic feature of Yahweh. Although Ps. 86 (like Neh. 9 and Dnl. 9) is also ultimately concerned with an improvement in the present circumstances of the petitioner (or of the people in Neh. 9 and Dnl. 9), there is no direct plea for forgiveness. Rather, Yahweh is again reminded that he is a good and forgiving (*sallāḥ*) God. The grammatical construction of the *qaṭṭāl* verbal adjective, a form occurring only in this passage, underscores "that here a divine attribute is being described, not merely a mode of action."[19] The enduring aspect of this forgiving element in God's personality is being emphasized.

Among those particular beneficent deeds for which Yahweh is to be extolled, the hymn Ps. 103 also mentions his forgiveness of sins. Within the framework of hymnic participial style, *slḥ* occurs as the ptcp. *hassōlēaḥ* next to the ptcp. *hārōpē'.* Forgiveness and healing are juxtaposed in *parallelismus membrorum* such that forgiveness must be interpreted in the sense of healing.[20] So again, forgiveness expresses itself in a concrete event of change toward a positive future.[21]

---

17. E. W. Nicholson, *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah Chapters 1–25. CBC* (1973), 209.
18. Göbel, 25.
19. Kedar, 107f.
20. Cf. in this connection also N. Lohfink, "Ich bin Jahwe, dein Arzt (Ex. 15,26)," *Ich will euer Gott werden: Beispiele biblischen Redens von Gott. SBS* 100 (1981), 11-73.
21. On the interconnection between forgiveness and healing, cf. also Hasel, 201.

In Ps. 130:4, within a lament, this recollection of Yahweh's forgiveness manifests itself in a fashion similar to that in Ps. 86. Although the petitioner knows that everyone is inadequate before God in view of human guilt, he also knows of the forgiveness *(s^{e}lîḥâ)* that is inherent in God *('imm^{e}ḵā)* and leads to the fear of God. This makes clear that *s^{e}lîḥâ* is not an entity to which one has a claim but rather a gift from God's free will.

Apart from prayer texts, such reference to Yahweh's willingness to forgive is also found in Isa. 55:7, where again, forgiveness is associated with repentance. The call to repentance and the hope in Yahweh's compassion are grounded in Yahweh's abundant forgiveness *(kî-yarbeh lislôaḥ)*. As in Jer. 31:31ff., this involves an association of forgiveness and a new covenant (according to Isa. 55:3 as *b^{e}rîṯ 'ôlām*), with Isa. 55 thinking of the Davidic covenant, and Jer. 31 of a heightened Sinai covenant. After the experiences of the exile as punishment, however, this sort of new relationship with God is conceivable only if Yahweh first forgives the people's apostasy.

4. *Plea for Forgiveness.* One further area in which *slḥ* is used is actually a continuation of the previous one, though with a direct plea for forgiveness. According to Ex. 34:9, after receiving the two tablets of the law Moses asks Yahweh to forgive *(w^{e}sālaḥtā)* the people's guilt and to make the people his own possession. This passage, whose literary-critical elements cannot be clearly classified,[22] stands in the context of covenant, as does Jer. 31:31ff. Here *b^{e}rîṯ* and *slḥ* are associated such that it seems as if *slḥ* represents the prolepsis for *b^{e}rîṯ*. Nu. 14:19 similarly contains a plea Moses issues for forgiveness of the people in view of their lack of trust during the wilderness wanderings. Yahweh is petitioned to forgive *(s^{e}laḥ-nā')*, just as he has already forgiven since Egypt (here together with → נשׂא *nāśā'*). Yahweh hears and answers this petition (v. 20). The prophetic intercession as well as the assurance of its fulfillment stands within the framework of a Deuteronomistic insertion whose plea for forgiveness and thus for sparing the people draws attention to God's honor, which should be preserved (vv. 15f.).[23] The basis rendering such forgiveness possible is the divine *ḥeseḏ* (vv. 18f.; cf. Ex. 34:6f.). The actualization of this forgiveness is not viewed in any suspension of specific punishments, but rather primarily in the preservation of the relationship between Yahweh and his people.[24]

Similarly, Amos's intercession and plea for forgiveness in view of his vision of the locust attack (Am. 7:1-3, *s^{e}laḥ-nā'*) are granted. The immediate context, to be sure, does not mention guilt as such, prompting C. Göbel to conclude that *slḥ* here is not being applied to sin.[25] But the broader context of the book of Amos suggests that the attack of locusts in this vision is to be understood as anticipated punishment for guilt, guilt for whose forgiveness Amos now petitions and is granted; as a result of Yahweh's own words, this swarm of locusts, which exists only in the vision, does not become a

22. According to M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 260f., the passage is secondary; according to B. Baentsch, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri. HKAT* I/2 (1903), 282, it is part of R^{je}.

23. Thiel, *Jeremia 26–45,* 26; Göbel, 23.

24. Cf. Sakenfeld, 327.

25. Pp. 21f.

reality. On the basis of the energetic *ḥdl* in Am. 7:5, G. Bartczek concludes that Amos's plea in 7:2 comes "extremely close to being a demand for one's right to forgiveness."[26] Although the amplification *nā'* does indeed lend emphasis to the prophet's plea, an actual demand for forgiveness can be derived neither from this element nor from the *ḥdl* in the following vision.

The petitioner in Ps. 25 appeals to Yahweh's name and thus to his honor when he asks Yahweh to forgive his great guilt (v. 11). L. Ruppert's analysis of the structure of this psalm clearly demonstrates that v. 11 constitutes the center of this prayer, and that the forgiveness of sin thus becomes the content of the petitioner's hope.[27] Although the concrete actualization of this forgiveness is not specified more clearly, it conceivably consists in enabling the petitioner to walk in the ways of Yahweh (vv. 4,5,12).

The plea for forgiveness occurs with a certain concentration in the Deuteronomistic section of Solomon's prayer at the temple dedication in 1 K. 8 (vv. 30,34,36,39,50) with the parallels in 2 Ch. 6 (vv. 21,25,27,30,39).[28] 1 K. 8:30 already petitions beforehand for forgiveness *(w^e^sālaḥtā)* in consideration of those who will come to the temple to entreat Yahweh in view of their own guilt. Vv. 34,36,39 then add the plea for forgiveness — a plea similarly presented beforehand — to various possible concrete cases of punishment resulting from incurred guilt (similarly *w^e^sālaḥtā*); in this context v. 39 also addresses the problem of the relationship between forgiveness and individual requital,[29] though without any resolution. V. 36aβ is to be viewed as an addendum, since the motive it presents for forgiveness disrupts the connection with v. 36b and also substantively does not fit the context.[30] In view of the contemporary situation, vv. 46ff. then address the possibility that the people sin against Yahweh and as punishment are deported by foreigners. If in such a situation they yet turn back to Yahweh, the petition asks that he might hear the supplication of the people and forgive them (*w^e^sālaḥtā*, v. 50). The function of these frequent proleptic references to forgiveness is probably the opening up of a positive future in view of the people's own distressful and guilt-ridden past.[31]

At the conclusion of this discussion of individual passages is a text distinguishing itself from all others insofar as it asks for the forgiveness of a non-Israelite. According to 2 K. 5:18, the Syrian Naaman asks Yahweh — again, proleptically — for forgiveness *(yislaḥ YHWH)* for a transgression that will be repeated consistently when he returns home, and even more, a transgression consisting of Naaman bowing before a foreign deity in the service of his master. G. Hentschel sees in this plea the addendum of a postexilic redactor: "Naaman is wrestling now with a problem experienced by later proselytes: How can the confession to monotheism be reconciled with the professional

26. *Prophetie und Vermittlung. EH* 23, *Theologie* 120 (1980), 129.
27. "Psalm 25 und die Grenze kultorientierter Psalmenexegese," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 576-82.
28. Cf. G. Braulik, "Spuren einer Neubearbeitung des dtr Geschichtswerkes in 1 Kön 8,52-53,59-60," *Bibl* 52 (1971) 20-33.
29. M. Noth, *Könige 1–16. BK* IX/1 (1968), 186.
30. Ibid., 187.
31. Cf. Göbel, 23; and Braulik.

obligations of a high state official?"[32] Although the granting of this petition does not occur *expressis verbis,* a tentative assent can be gleaned indirectly from Elisha's answer, so that not only the petition itself is unique within the OT but also the answer as regards the worship of foreign deities.

III. Sirach and Qumran. The root *slḥ* occurs 3 times in Sirach (5:5,6; 16:11). Both 5:5 and 6 warn against the notion that forgiveness is possible without repentance or that sin is automatically forgiven (*s*^{e}*lîḥâ,* v. 5; *yslḥ,* v. 6). In contrast, 16:11 speaks positively about forgiveness in the sense of a statement concerning Yahweh's attributes. He has both compassion and anger, he pardons *(wnwś')* and forgives *(wswlḥ),* and he pours out his anger upon evildoers. Here the problem of forgiveness and individual requital is picked up once again. Sirach does not provide any more concrete notion of how forgiveness manifests itself.

In the Qumran texts *slḥ* occurs both as a verb and as a substantive. The Temple Scroll consistently attests verbal usage. In the extremely problematical text 11QT 18:8, one should probably reconstruct *w*^{e}*nislaḥ* in analogy to Lev. 23:14. 11QT 26:10 attests the niphal *w*^{e}*nislaḥ l*^{e}*hēmâ* (cf. Lev. 4:20) in connection with the summary of the biblical texts concerning the theme of the day of reconciliation. Both 11QT 53:21 and 54:3 refer back to Nu. 30 regarding the problem of a woman's oath that lacks the consent of her father or husband. Here the Temple Scroll replaces *yislaḥ* with Yahweh as the subject (the form found in the biblical passage) with a Yahweh discourse in the 1st person singular. Apart from the Temple Scroll, the root is used verbally also in 1QS 2:8 *(yislaḥ)* and 1QH 14:24 *(hassōlēaḥ).* The remaining passages attest the noun *s*^{e}*lîḥâ* (1QS 2:15; 1QH 5:2; 6:9; 7:18,30,35; 9:13,34; 10:21; 11:9,31; CD 2:4). The desire for a denial of forgiveness for apostates is taken as a theme in 1QS 2:8(14),15, and perhaps also in the unclear text of 1QH 7:18.

Such references to forgiveness, however, find their center of gravity in the hymnic texts, where it represents one of the factors prompting the praise of Yahweh, occurring also in connection with references to *ḥeseḏ* and *raḥ*^{a}*mîm.* It is striking that except for 1QS 2:14; 1QH 6:9; 7:18, the noun is always used in the plural, thus lending an element of amplification to the statement.

IV. LXX. The variety of aspects encountered in the use of the root *slḥ* is especially evident in the renderings of the LXX. A great many translation possibilities are employed, among which especially *aphiénai, exiláskesthai,* and *híleōs eínai* with their derivative forms should be mentioned.

Hausmann

32. *2 Könige. NEB* (1985), 24. Cf. Levin, 134 n. 2.

סָלַל sālal; סֹלְלָה sōl^elâ; מְסִלָּה m^esillâ; מַסְלוּל maslûl

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Distribution in the OT. III. LXX. IV. Meaning and Theological Use: 1. The Verb; 2. Nouns. V. Qumran.

I. Etymology. The root *sll* (with its Sam. variant *swl*) is attested primarily only in Hebrew. It occurs 12 times as a verb (qal 10 times; pilpel in Prov. 4:8; hithpolel in Ex. 9:17 [cf. Sir. 40:28]), with all these passages sharing the common semantic component of "lift up high, pile up," understood either concretely or in the figurative sense: "hold up" in the sense of "praise," "honor," reflexively as "behave haughtily/insolently." The semantic evidence in Post-Biblical Hebrew accords with these findings: "jump, rise up," and in the pilel/polel "engage in lewd behavior";[1] and the meaning of the deverbal nouns *sōl^elâ,* "siege ramp" (11 occurrences), *m^esillâ,* "road, highway" (27 times),[2] and *maslûl,* "road, highway" (once) in the sense of "banked highway." It is still disputed whether *sullām,* "stepped ramp, staircase" (Gen. 28:12), is to be ascribed to the root in question.[3] Only *m^esillâ/maslûl* is also attested in other Semitic languages: so perhaps Akk. *mušlālu,* "a temple or palace gate with freestanding staircase in Assyria,"[4] and Ugar. *msl* in the combination *mslmt* as the name of a mythical mountain;[5] Moab. *hmslt,* "the road, highway";[6] and in South Semitic, Tigre *salal,* "mule track"; Amhar. *masalal,* "ladder."[7]

II. Distribution in the OT. The distribution of the verb is not particularly significant. The word already occurs quite early in Hebrew poetry (Ps. 68:5[Eng. v. 4]), then extends through J (Ex. 9:17), the proverbial literature of the monarchy (Prov. 4:8; 15:19) and Jeremiah (18:15; 50:26), postexilic Trito-Isaiah (Isa. 57:14; 62:10), to the late postexilic poetry of Job (19:12; 30:12). In the meaning "bank up (a road)" it se-

---

sālal. I. Eph'al, "The Assyrian Siege Ramp at Lachish: Military and Lexical Aspects," *Tel Aviv* 11 (1984) 60-70; A. Schulten, "Masada: Die Burg des Herodes und die römischen Lager," *ZDPV* 56 (1933) 1-185; H. Strobel, "Das römische Belagerungswerk um Machärus," *ZDPV* 90 (1974) 128-84; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 236-38; H. Weippert, "Belagerung," *BRL²,* 37-41; Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans., New York, 1963); idem, *Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand* (Eng. trans., New York, 1966).

1. *ANH,* 291; *WTM,* III, 532f.
2. → דרך *derek (derekh),* III, 278f.
3. On this discussion cf. *HAL,* II, 757; W. Baumgartner, "Das semitische Wort für 'Leiter, Treppe,'" *TZ* 7 (1951) 465ff.
4. *AHw,* II, 684; *CAD,* X/2, 277.
5. *KTU,* 1.10, III 28; *WUS,* no. 1612; cf. M. Dietrich et al., "Zur ugaritischen Lexikographie (VII)," *UF* 5 (1973) 84f.; *UT,* no. 1761, associates this with Heb. *sullām.*
6. *KAI,* 181:26.
7. *WbTigr,* 167; Leslau, *Contributions,* 37.

mantically resembles → פנה pānâ, "clear (a way)" (cf. Isa. 40:1; par. with *sālal* in Isa. 57:14), and is specified more closely through *siqqēl min,* "clear of stones" (Isa. 62:10). Objects include paronomastic *m^e sillâ* (Isa. 62:10), *derek̲, 'ōraḥ,* and *'orḥâ,* and figuratively also wisdom. The term *sōl^e lâ,* like *dāyēq,*[8] represents a term used primarily for describing military events (2 S. 20:15; 2 K. 19:32; par. Isa. 37:33), whence primarily it found its way into the prophetic portrayal of judgment in connection with the conquest of a city (3 occurrences in Jeremiah; 4 in Ezekiel; once in Daniel). It occurs 9 times in the singular, primarily as the object of → שׁפך *šāpak̲* (cf. Neo-Assyr. *eprī šapāku,* translated literally in Hab. 1:10);[9] a different situation obtains regarding *dāyēq,* which occurs only as the object of *nāṯan* or *bānâ.*

III. LXX. The LXX obviously experienced problems with this verb. It renders the concrete meaning with *hodopoieín* (Isa. 62:10; Job 30:12; Ps. 68:5[4]) and *tríbein* (Prov. 15:19), and the figurative meaning with *pericharakoún* (Prov. 4:8), *empoieín* (Ex. 9:17), and *epaiteín* (Sir. 40:28). In other instances it relies on paraphrases. It renders *m^e sillâ* as *hodós* (12 times), *tríbos* (9 times), and *anábasis* (4 times). The understanding of *sōl^e lâ* is again more varied: *chárax* (4 times), *próschōma* (3 times; cf. the differing translations in Isa. 37:33 par. 2 K. 19:32), *charakobolía,* and *óchlos* (once each), paraphrased in Jer. 6:6 *(dýnamis),* and obviously mistaken in a technical military sense in Dnl. 11:15 *(dóru).* The LXX does not seem to have had a clear understanding of *sōl^e lâ.* According to 2 S. 20:15, the reference is clearly to a *próschōma* reaching to the city wall (a siege ramp), while according to Ezk. 26:8 it understands it as a *circumvallatio (kyklǭ cháraka).* Similarly, the LXX is somewhat uncertain concerning *chárax* (cf. Ezk. 21:27). Finally, in Isa. 35:8 it (like 1QIsa^a with *mswll)* no longer understands the hapax legomenon *maslûl,* misreading it instead from *ṭhwr*[10] or *brwr (BHS)* (cf. the similar misreading of the verb in Isa. 57:14).

IV. Meaning and Theological Use.

1. *The Verb.* The verb might already be used in the figurative sense in its earliest occurrence. In the hymnic introit Ps. 68:5(4) (ancient Israelite Tabor tradition)[11] we find the exhortation to sing to God *(šîrû)* and to praise his name *(zamm^e rû)* parallel with the imperative: *sōllû lārōk̲ēḇ bā^a rāḇôṯ,* which in this context can hardly be interpreted differently than "exult to him who rides upon the clouds." A literal rendering (as in the LXX: *hodopoieín)* is not indicated by the parallels. One might, however, take note of M. Weippert's reference to Akk. *sullû,* "invoke" (an Akkadian loanword?).[12] The second passage using *sll* figuratively, Prov. 4:8, is probably to be dated to the late monarchy: "Prize her [Wisdom] highly (*sll* pilpel), and she will exalt you (*rwm* pilpel); she will honor you *(kibbēḏ)* if you embrace her." The chiastic structure of the verse places

8. Cf. *HAL,* I, 220f.
9. *CAD,* V, 187; concerning this usage, see further Eph'al, 64.
10. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja (28–39). BK* X/3 (1982), in loc.
11. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1989), 50-51.
12. *AHw,* II, 1056; *CAD,* XV, 366ff.

sll pilpel and *ḥbq* piel, "embrace," in correlation. O. Plöger suggests that the choice of the latter term was prompted by similarities of sound.[13] Since v. 8a does not pay attention to this, however, it seems more as if a language with rare terminology was chosen for a hieratic characterization of wisdom discourse. The only protocanonical occurrence of the hithpolel, Ex. 9:17 (J), turns the figurative meaning into the reflexive in the sense of "holding oneself high, playing oneself up." C. F. Keil's suggestion is instructive, according to which Moses' threat to Pharaoh preserves the fundamental meaning of *sll,* namely, "stack, gather oneself up = resist": "if you continue to play yourself up as the great Lord over my people"; this suggestion has not, however, everywhere been accepted. Sir. 40:28 also points in this direction: "My son, do not lead the life of a beggar; it is better to die than to be importunate *(sll)*" (EÜ).

All the remaining occurrences stay with the literal meaning, "to bank up (a road)." Prov. 15:19 compares the way of a sluggard with a path overgrown with thorns, while the path of the upright is level (pass. ptcp.). Sir. 39:24 picks up the same notion; the ways of God are straight *(tmym)* for the upright, and commensurately constructed *(ystwllw)* for the wicked. As indicated by the LXX *(proskómmata),* a negative qualification is associated here with *sll* hithpael. Since this cannot otherwise be seen in the passages attesting the literal usage,[14] one can observe here in late Hebrew the negative qualification of a retrospective association of the figurative meaning (cf. Ex. 9:17) with the literal meaning.

In an invective against godforsaken Israel, Jeremiah proclaims that Yahweh causes them to stumble in their ways, the well-worn roads, so that they must proceed on an "unprepared way" *(dereḵ lô' s^elûlâ),* an allusion to the procession of exiles not immediately clear from the context (Jer. 18:15). Here, however, a specific terminology is fixed that in the Isaiah tradition first is reversed and made into a designation for the homecoming of the exiles (Isa. 40:3f., → פנה *pānâ* [*dereḵ*], and then — with terminological differentiation — becomes a designation for the preparation of the future way of salvation (with *sll* in Isa. 57:14; 62:10).[15]

In what is certainly a post-Jeremianic invective against Babylon (Jer. 50:26), we encounter a unique employment of *sll* in the sense of a piling up of grain for the purpose of incineration. Not until the late postexilic poetry of Job is *sll* used in its original basic meaning. Job laments that his oppressors cast up paths (i.e., in the metaphor of military threat: siege ramps) against him (Job 19:12; 30:12). In and of itself, this imagery already evokes the terror of imminent siege, and is amplified even further here through the fact that God himself is Job's oppressor.

2. *Nouns.* The paradigmatic banked entity indicated through *sll* is the damlike *m^esillâ,*[16] and in the military sphere the *sōl^elâ,* a siege ramp that is banked up against a city wall for bringing forward siege engines and battering rams. The *locus classicus* for

13. *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 45.
14. See discussion below.
15. Cf. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), in loc.; and IV.2 below.
16. → דרך *dereḵ (derekh)* (III, 270-93).

a siege with a *sōl^elâ* "reaching to the ramparts" *(ʿāmad bahēl)* is the account of Joab's siege of Abel-beth-maacah (2 S. 20:14f.).[17] According to this account, the city is hermetically sealed off during the siege (perhaps by means of palisades; cf. the siege of Megiddo by Thutmose III).[18] Heb. *dāyēq* refers to this kind of encirclement (cf. *sāḇîḇ*, 2 K. 25:1, et passim), though without any more specific description.[19] During the Roman period,[20] such enclosure by ramparts becomes customary; compare the 2 km. (1.2 mi.) *circumvallatio* before Machaerus and the 4.5 km. (2.8 mi.) *circumvallatio* around Masada.[21] The actual siege itself is prepared by banking up a *sōl^elâ* and by undermining the city wall, a technique also associated with Sennacherib in 701.[22] For reasons of stability such a siege ramp consisted of banked up *(špk)* stones with a built-in *(bnh)* wooden framework.[23]

In addition to Masada, Sennacherib's Assyrian city ramp in Lachish has generated special archaeological interest. A surprising revelation, however, has been the recently discovered counterramp on the city side of the wall,[24] apparently serving to strengthen the city wall and to facilitate bringing forward a larger number of defenders at the moment of assault. Since the construction of such a counterramp involved creating breaches in the existing structure as well as tearing down houses for fill material, the existence of such counterramps throws new light on several biblical passages.

In an invective, Jer. 6:6 demands the felling of trees and the casting up of a *sōl^elâ* against Jerusalem, since nothing but oppression is found there. This summons contradicts the stipulation in Dt. 20:19f., according to which the besiegers are to protect the trees around a besieged city.[25] The prophet's own utterly realistic observations provide the background to the statements in Jer. 32:24 and 33:4. Since the latter passage must be referring quite precisely to the construction of a counterramp, it can be dated reliably to the siege of Jerusalem itself immediately after the beginning of the construction of the Babylonian siege ramp.

Ezk. 4:2; 17:17; and 21:27(22) are also alluding to Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Jerusalem, with the prophet giving a precise account of the military-tactical elements: siege *(māṣôr)*, enclosing siege wall *(dāyēq)*, siege ramp *(sōl^elâ)*, troop camps out front *(maḥ^anôṯ)*, siege rams *(kārîm)*. In the invective against Tyre, the prophet seems in 26:8 to be describing proleptically the spectacular siege and assault of this island fortress by Alexander the Great. A siege wall *(dāyēq)* cuts off any land access. Then a 600-m. (1,970-ft.) siege ramp is built, a shield mantelet is erected *(ṣinnâ)*,[26] a siege ram *(m^eḥî qāḇāl)* set up, and iron jimmies or axes *(ḥ^arāḏôṯ)* applied to the towers. Since the vo-

17. On siege terminology → חנה *ḥānâ*, V, 8-9; → צור *ṣwr:* מצור *māṣôr.*
18. *TGI* (1950), 19-21.
19. *HAL*, I, 220f.
20. Cf. *KAI*, 202A:10, which may already attest a *circumvallatio* for the 8th century.
21. On Machaerus see Strobel; on Masada see Yadin, Weippert, et al.
22. Weippert, *BRL²*, 39.
23. Cf. Yadin, *Masada;* Ephʿal, 65.
24. Personal communication from H. and M. Weippért; cf. Ephʿal, 67ff.
25. For further discussion, cf. Ephʿal, 65.
26. → מגן *māgēn* (VIII, 74-87).

cabulary of this particular passage varies considerably from that of Ezekiel's other siege accounts (cf. also Isa. 37:33; 2 K. 19:32), we are probably correct in assuming the presence of a later redactor here.[27]

The text of Isa. 35:8 is overloaded. Precisely the term *maslûl,* which later was no longer understood (cf. 1QIsa[a] *mswll*), prompted more specific explanations. This salvific promise (probably secondary) combines the motif of 40:3 with the continuation of 57:14 and 62:10,[28] and develops this further in the sense of a universal cosmic peace. This banked highway, a way, a holy way, is intended solely for those returning home; unclean persons and wild animals are kept away from it (35:9f.). The assumption of this sort of motif combination spares us any uncertain text-critical procedures.

V. Qumran. The root occurs only 5 times in the writings of Qumran, with only 1 of these involving the verb: 4Q177 (4QCatena[a]) frs. 1-4, 10 in an uncertain context, perhaps with the meaning "be elevated." The term *m[e]sillâ* occurs 4 times (1QS 8:14 in the basic citation from Isa. 40:3. 4Q185 frs. 1-2, 2:2 and 4Q511 (4QShir[b]) fr. 2, 1:6 seem to be alluding to this founding document of the Qumran-Essene movement. The occurrence in 2Q23 6:2 is corrupt.

Fabry

27. Cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 33f.
28. Cf. IV.1 above.

סֶלַע *sela'*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT: 1. Geographical Meaning; 2. Figurative Meaning. III. LXX. IV. Qumran.

I. Etymology. The noun *sela',* "rock, rocks/boulders (collective)," occurs also in Samaritan *(sīla),* Jewish Aramaic *(sal'ā),* Syriac *(sa/el'ā),* and Ethiopic *(ṣōlā').* In

sela'. F. M. Abel, *Géographie de la Palestine I-II* (Paris, 1933/38); C. M. Bennett, "Fouilles d'Umm el-Biyara," *RB* 73 (1966) 372-403; G. Bertram, "Der Sprachschatz der Septuaginta und der des hebräischen AT," *ZAW* 57 (1939) 85-101; O. Cullmann, "πέτρα," *TDNT,* VI, 95-99; H. Donner, "Der Felsen und der Tempel," *ZDPV* 93 (1977) 1-11; D. Eichhorn, *Gott als Fels, Burg und Zuflucht. EH* 23/4 (1972); K. Elliger, "Sela," *BHHW,* III (1966), 1761; M. Lindner, ed., *Petra und das Königreich der Nabatäer* (Munich, [4]1983); H. Schmidt, *Der heilige Fels in Jerusalem* (Tübingen, 1933); A. Schwarzenbach, *Die geographische Terminologie im Hebräischen des AT* (Leiden, 1954); J. Simons, *GTTOT;* E. Vogt, "Vom Tempel zum Felsendom," *Bibl* 55 (1974) 23-64.

Arabic the root *sl'* appears in the verb *sali'a* I, "crack, become cracked," VII, "split, burst," and in the noun *sal,* "cleft, fissure."[1] In Ugaritic the root *sl'* occurs in the place-names *sila* and *silḫana,* and in the PNs *sil'ānu* and *sl'y/n.*[2]

In Middle Hebrew, *sl'* means "rock, stone," though also "weight stone" (Biblical Heb. *'eḇen,* Dt. 25:13), "weight" (frequently made of stones), and "selah" as the name of a coin valued at the biblical shekel.[3] As a coin designation, "selah" also occurs in Aramaic, Nabatean, and Palmyrene.[4]

II. OT. The noun *sela'* occurs 63 times in the OT, is semantically related to the more frequently used noun → צוּר *ṣûr,* and is used with both geographical and metaphorical meaning.

1. *Geographical Meaning.* a. *Geological Forms.* Crags and rock crevices offer various animals both habitat and hiding places. Thus the high mountains with their crags belong to the mountain goat (Job 39:1), while the rock crevices offer both a home (Ps. 104:18) and refuge (Prov. 30:26) to the rock badger. The dove nests on steep rock walls (Cant. 2:14), though above all this is true of the eagle, which dwells on the crags of the mountains (Job 39:28). The habit of flies and bees in settling in the steep ravines of the valleys and in the clefts of the rocks provides the image to which a prophetic oracle of judgment alludes, asserting that on the day of eschatological reordering Yahweh will whistle like a beekeeper to the flies at the mouth of the Nile in Egypt and to the bees in Assyria (Isa. 7:18f.). In its present form,[5] the saying envisions a mighty army occupying the entire country, even into its smallest hiding place; this army, like the eschatological assault of the nations similarly called forth by Yahweh (cf. Ezk. 38–39; Zech. 12–14), threatens Jerusalem and Zion.

Rocks and crevices also serve as hiding places for people and things. In his judgment upon Judah, Yahweh calls forth hunters with the task of pursuing the wicked into their hiding places in the rock crevices, there to slay them like game (Jer. 16:16). Within the framework of an apparently only visionary symbolic act, the prophet Jeremiah hides a belt, purchased at Yahweh's behest, in a cleft of a rock near the Euphrates, where after many days it spoils (Jer. 13:4). This symbolic act alludes to the deportation of the inhabitants of Judah to Babylonia, where the honor of this once proud people vanishes.

This context probably also includes Ps. 141:6 — whose textual peculiarities can be understood only with difficulty — and its assertion that during persecution the leaders of the righteous, their "judges," had to withdraw from their enemies and hide in rock caves. The expression the psalm uses here, one seemingly incomprehensible, that the judges "had plunged [reflexive niphal of *šmṭ,* corresponding to the qal of

---

1. *HAL,* II, 758; Wehr, s.v.
2. *PNU,* 185.
3. *WTM,* s.v.
4. *WTM,* s.v.; *DNSI,* II, 788.
5. For literary criticism of the passage cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 321f.

nāpal in the meaning 'flee, run away to'] into the rocks [*bîḏê sela'* after a verb of movement: into the rocks]," can be explained on the basis of the language used by the psalm itself (cf. *mîḏê paḥ* in v. 9) and from the inclination of the inhabitants of Israel to hide in rock caves in times of danger (cf. 1 S. 13:6; 23:25, etc.). The whole verse then reads: "And even if their judges have plunged into the rocks, they shall hear that my words are beneficial (for them)." Those who are threatened shall accordingly hear that the petitioner has friendly words, wishes, and prayers for their salvation and their deliverance.[6]

The court official Shebna, whom Isaiah views as an upstart, has a splendid tomb for himself hewn out of the *sela'* (Isa. 22:16). This refers not to a cave tomb but rather to a block hewn out of the face of the rock into a shape similar to a house and containing a grave chamber created through hollowing out.[7]

The *sela'* in the account of Gideon's call (Jgs. 6:20, an account later than the context) appears as a sacrificial site; on this *sela'* bread and meat are consumed by a flame springing up from the rock (v. 21: *ṣûr;* cf. also Jgs. 13:19). This portrayal reflects the relationship between altar and sacrifice, since in Palestine offerings were made on the natural surface of the rock, though also on a hewn stone, a single stone block, or an altar built of stone. That the flame springing out of the rock consumes the bread and meat is here an expression of the consummation of the sacrifice.[8] By contrast, those who worship idols offer child sacrifices under the overhanging crags *(taḥaṯ sᵉ'îpê hassᵉlā'îm)* in the valleys (Isa. 57:5).[9] This remark (one probably influenced by Ezk. 16:21) alludes to the worship of Molech forbidden in the Holiness Code (Lev. 18:21), at which children born during the course of a fertility cult are sacrificed back to the god.[10] Hence on the day of Yahweh's judgment these idol worshipers will seek refuge in vain under the rocks of these sacrificial sites (Isa. 2:21).

At the miracle of the water at Meribah, Yahweh instructs Moses to speak to the *sela'* before the assembly of the people of God (in contradistinction to Ex. 17:1,6, where he is to strike his staff on the *ṣûr*), so that the rock will readily give forth water (Nu. 20:8,10f.). According to this portrayal — typical for P^G — Yahweh's word, attested by the holder of the spiritual office, is able to transform the rigid reality of this world.[11] An echo of this giving forth of water from the *sela'* is found in an apparently already fixed element of tradition within the account of Yahweh's salvific deeds in guiding his people (Neh. 9:15; Ps. 78:16). The poetic-hymnic witness of the Song of Moses also refers to Yahweh's miraculous guidance of Israel, according to which God made his

6. So maintaining the MT, H. Junker, "Einige Rätsel im Urtext der Psalmen: Ps. 141,5-7," *Bibl* 30 (1949) 204-6; a different result emerges after textual emendation; cf. R. Tournay, "Psaume CXLI: Nouvelle interprétation," *RB* 90 (1983) 321-33.

7. So H. Wildberger, *Isiah 13–27* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1997), 387, who in this connection refers to the tomb of a house steward in Silvan near Jerusalem, since this particular site provides a good illustration of the tomb of a distinguished man from the time of Isaiah.

8. R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 407-9.

9. Cf. *HAL,* II, 762, s.v. *sā'îp* I.

10. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 344; → מלך *mōleḵ* (VIII, 375-88).

11. E. Zenger, *Israel am Sinai* (Altenberg, 1982), 65.

people suck honey out of the *sela'* and oil from the hard *ṣûr* (Dt. 32:13), meaning that God bestowed the bounty of the promised land on his people in great abundance.

b. *Proper Names.* In several instances *sela'* appears as the designation for a place or region in the land of the Edomites. After defeating ten thousand Edomites in the Valley of Salt, Amaziah, king of Judah (797-769), took *hassela'* by storm and called it Joktheel (2 K. 14:7). Since the goal of the Judeans' campaign was to secure access to Elath, with the Valley of Salt referring apparently to the Arabah, some have identified *hassela'* with Umm el-Biyarah, the mountain with the high plateau rising 300 m. (about 1,000 ft.) over the western part of the stone city of Petra; this mountain became the characterizing feature of the later Nabatean metropolis. Excavations have revealed that on the peak of Umm el-Biyarah an Edomite settlement did indeed exist, though its archaeological late dating (7th-5th centuries B.C.) cannot be reconciled with the biblical portrayal.[12] Neither is there any evidence for Petra having been called Joktheel. All the same, some geographical relationship between the biblical account and the mountains of Petra and region of Edom cannot be excluded in principle. Although archaeological excavations in this area are still in their infancy, the discovery has been made — apart from the Iron Age settlement of Umm el-Biyarah — of a 7th-millennium B.C. preceramic Neolithic settlement in the village of Seil Aqlat in the region of el-Beda, a few kilometers north of Petra; in the vicinity of this settlement there is an even older settlement, a cave dwelling from the Upper Paleolithic period.[13] Another strong possibility is the mountain settlement or refuge citadel es-Sela', about 50 km. (30 mi.) north of Petra, where a complete settlement sequence from the Early Bronze Age (3rd millennium B.C.) to the Mameluke period (14th-15th centuries A.D.) can be demonstrated.[14] These sparse but archaeologically reliable data allow the assumption that the biblical mention of *hassela'* (2 K. 14:7) is referring either to the mountainous region of Edom in the larger sense, a region already with a long history of settlement, or, more likely, to one of the many rocky sites there east of the Arabah that were suitable as fortresses and refuge citadels, which could also have included Umm el-Biyarah. In any event, the Chronicler later understood *hassela'* in his source to be a designation for a rocky mountain formation from whose peak *(rō'š hassela')* the captured Edomites were thrown to their death (2 Ch. 25:12).

Obadiah apparently also refers to the mountainous region in the eastern part of the Arabah when he associates Edom's arrogance with its dwelling place high in the invulnerable rocky crags (*ḥāgwê-sela',* Ob. 3). In any case, this understanding is supported by the parallel tradition in the book of Jeremiah (Jer. 49:16), where the rocky crags mentioned in Obadiah appear in an emphatic generalization with the article (*ḥagwê-hassela',* as in Cant. 2:14).

Similarly, the prophet's summons to the inhabitants of *sela'* to praise Yahweh (Isa. 42:11) is not referring to a city with this name, but rather to the previously mentioned

12. Cf. Bennett.

13. P. Parr, "Vierzig Jahre Ausgrabungen in Petra: 1929 bis 1969," in Lindner, 139-49.

14. M. Lindner, "Es-Sela': Eine antike Fliehburg 50km nördlich von Petra," in Lindner, 258-71.

Edomite mountain country in the eastern part of the Arabah. That is, this understanding of *sela'* as an appellative with the meaning "rocky region" or "mountain range" is unmistakably supported here by its parallelism with the synonym "mountains" *(hārîm)* in the same verse, as well as by what in this context is apparently the intentional gradation "coastlands — steppe — mountains."[15] The same region is probably involved in the evidence of the book of Judges — evidence whose textual problems cannot be resolved unequivocally — according to which the region of Edom (so instead of MT Amorites) extended from the "Ascent of Scorpions" situated in the southern part of Judah (cf. Josh. 15:3) to the *sela'* (dittography of *m*) and upward (Jgs. 1:36).

The understanding of *sela'* in Isa. 16:1 also poses difficulties; here an unknown prophet demands that one send rams to the ruler of the land, from *sela',* into the desert to the mountain of the daughter of Zion (16:1). This demand stands at the beginning of the middle section of a collection of sayings dealing with Moab and its fate in Yahweh's judgment (15:1–16:14). This particular section (16:1-5) is probably the work of the redactor of the entire collection of sayings, since it differs both formally (addressed to Moab and its inhabitants) and thematically (concentration on Zion and David's residence) from its surroundings (discourses on Moab and its cities), and since the parallel tradition in the book of Jeremiah (Jer. 48:1-47) has no corresponding passages. As evidenced by the framing statements (Isa. 16:1 and 4b,5), the content of this middle section focuses on the restoration of David's theocracy, since it speaks of the ruler of the land (on the use of *mšl,* cf. Jgs. 8:22f.; 2 S. 23:3; Jer. 30:21; Mic. 5:1[Eng. v. 2]; Zech. 6:13), who assumes the throne of his ancestor David in Jerusalem (cf. Isa. 9:6[7]) and as the lord of his people guarantees justice and righteousness (cf. Isa. 11:3-5). Hence with an obvious reference back to the ruling claims of the old Davidic kingdom to Moab (cf. Ps. 60:10[8]), and by alluding to an earlier tribute (cf. 2 K. 3:4), the prophet issues the summons within the framing statement to do homage before this new David. Within the horizon of messianic expectation structured in this way, the core statement in this section directs itself to Moab, which has been humbled in Yahweh's judgment (v. 2), summoning it to open itself with conviction to the dominion of this new David and to give refuge and help (vv. 3,4a) to the people of God who were scattered at the collapse of Judah (cf. v. 4: RSV "my outcasts"). Assuming this interpretation accords with the redactor's intentions, the difficulty in determining the meaning of *sela'* at the beginning (v. 1) resolves itself. The directive "from *sela'* (outward) into the desert to the mountain of the daughter Zion" is then focusing on what for Judah was still an ongoing condition of judgment (on the term "desert" in this sense, cf. 40:3; 41:18; 43:19), and on the other hand is contrasting Mt. Zion with the previously mentioned *sela'.* Analogous to the use of *sela'* in connection with Edom (2 K. 14:7; Jer. 49:16; Ob. 3), the reference is thus to the mountainous country of Moab as such (as also in Jer. 48:28).

The cleft in the rock at Etam *(s*^{e}*'îp̱ sela' 'ēṭām)* in which Samson hid from the Philistines (Jgs. 15:8,11,13) is probably located in present-day 'Araq Isma'in east of

15. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40:1–45:7). BK* XI/1 (1978), 248.

'Artuf near Beth-shemesh. Even today, this Samson tradition still attaches to a cavern visible high and to the left shortly after one enters the mountains by train traveling from Jaffa to Jerusalem.[16]

After their defeat at Gibeah, the Benjaminites fled to Selah Rimmon (*sela' rimmôn,* NRSV "rock of Rimmon"), present-day Rammûn east of Bethel (Jgs. 20:45,47), where they also received the peace proposal of the assembly of the people of Israel (Jgs. 21:13).

Jonathan reaches the advanced position of the Philistines at the rocky crags *(šēn hassela')* Bozez (*bôṣēṣ,* "the slippery one") and Seneh (*senneh,* "the thorn, the prickly one"), both of which are located in the Wâdī eṣ-Ṣuweinît at Michmash and Geba (1 S. 14:4).

During his flight from Saul, David hides in the steppe of Maon at a place called *sela' hammaḥlᵉqôṯ,* which is not identified more specifically; in this context, it is considered the "rock of separation [RSV 'of escape']" (1 S. 23:25,28). This name, originally deriving probably from *ḥlq* I, "be bald," referring to the appearance of the rock itself, is in this context associated with *ḥlq* II, "separate," since it was at this place that Saul decided to cease pursuing David and to move against the Philistines who were invading Judah.

In Balaam's Kenite oracle, the unusual comparison between the Kenites and predatory birds that build their nest *(qēn)* in rocks *(sela')* (Nu. 24:21) is based apparently on a wordplay, since the comparison encompasses both the name of the Kenites and the topographical features of their dwelling place in the Negeb.

The assertion that the Israelites hid from the Philistines in the cavernous eastern slope of the *sela'* extending from Benjamin to the Jordan (1 S. 13:6) refers to a specific place as little as is *sela'* in comparison with Edom and Moab; rather, this refers in a general fashion to the rocky region of the area in question with its abundant hiding places and places of refuge.

2. *Figurative Meaning.* a. *Metaphors.* The function of *sela'* as a metaphor is evident when Jeremiah compares the countenance of the stubborn people with the hardness of a rock (Jer. 5:3), or when he says that Yahweh's word is like a glowing fire and like a hammer that breaks rocks into pieces (Jer. 23:29; cf. also 1 K. 19:11). The use of *sela'* is similarly metaphorical when Amos compares the perversion of justice and righteousness, so mortally dangerous to the community, to the treatment of horses who are driven on rocky ground and thereby ruined (Am. 6:12). This imagery is based on what for Amos's time was the customary understanding that horses were used largely as draught animals for chariots, which operated primarily on the plain. By contrast, rocky terrain ruins horses.[17]

Ezekiel accuses the inhabitants of Jerusalem of having shed innocent blood in the city and of having put that blood *'al-ṣᵉḥîaḥ sela'* (Ezk. 24:7); in what follows, Yahweh

---

16. H. W. Hertzberg, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth. ATD* IX (^{6}1985), 231f.
17. H. W. Wolff, *Joel and Amos. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1977), 285.

confirms that he has not covered the blood there and thus not silenced its cry for avenging intervention (Ezk. 24:8). Here the image of the "bare [lit. gleaming] rock" underscores the dangerous vivacity of the violent deed demanding atonement.[18] The same imagery recurs in the prophet's invective against Tyre, according to which Yahweh executes his judgment on this city and in the process washes away all memory of it, so that only the "bare rock" remains as a place for drying fishnets (Ezk. 26:4,14).

The prophet's threat that Yahweh will roll Babylon down from the *s^e lā'îm* in judgment (Jer. 51:25) obviously possesses metaphorical character insofar as it uses the location of the capital on top of a rocky elevation by the Euphrates — a topographically inaccurate image — as a circumscription for its generally accepted invulnerability.

The *sela'* appears as a metaphor for lethal severity when a psalmist considers those to be blessed who seize the children of Babylon and dash them to pieces against a rock (Ps. 137:9).

The prophet draws attention to the salvific significance — in contrast to the past — of the responsible leaders within the people of God, comparing them with a protective shelter from the wind, a place of refuge from the tempest, and the shade of a mighty *sela'* in the wilderness (Isa. 32:2). Likewise, the security of the upright, grounded in God, is for the prophet like the protection of a citadel of refuge on high rocks (Isa. 33:16). The petitioner similarly casts his own thanks in metaphorical language when he confesses that God drew him out of the pit and set him on a secure rock (Ps. 40:3[2]).

According to the words of the prophet, at Yahweh's deliverance of Jerusalem from the assault of the godless Assyrian the enemy will discover that his own *sela'* will pass away in terror, and that his princes, full of panic, will abandon their standards (Isa. 31:9). Both the *parallelismus membrorum* and the context itself suggest that *sela'* here is a symbol for the king of Assyria, who thus appears as the counterpart of Yahweh, the *sela'* of his own believers (Ps. 18:3[2]; 31:4[3]; 42:10[9]; 71:3).

b. *Yahweh as a Rock.* Several prayers of trust and of thanksgiving within the Psalter use the term *sela'* as an address and designation for Yahweh; in connection with the term → צוּר *ṣûr,* which adds an element of intensification, this term represents a circumscription of the tutelary power Yahweh possesses for his believers (Ps. 18:3[2] par. 2 S. 22:2; Ps. 31:4[3]; 42:10[9]; 71:3). Since the term *ṣûr,* an apparent equivalent to *sela',* is used both as an address and designation for Yahweh and also as a reference to the cultically distinguished site of Zion (cf. Ps. 27:5; 61:3-5[2-4]), there has long been a tendency to view the use of the two terms *sela'* and *ṣûr* as an allusion to the sacred rock of the Jerusalem temple mount.[19] The assumption is that during the pre-Israelite period this rock became associated with the notion of a towering cosmic foundation, existing firmly since the primal age. After the establishment of the Davidic high kingdom and the construction of the temple on Zion, Israel appropriated this sacral tradition concerning the sacred rock as the locus of revelation for the god of the Jebusites, a tradition specific to Jerusalem, and claimed it for Yahweh. The address and designation

18. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 500.
19. See Schmidt.

of Yahweh as the *sela'* of his believers then emerged in cultic acts that now mediated the revelations of Yahweh at the sacred rock at Jerusalem, acts accessible only to that particular circle of persons privileged through their respective institutions (king, cultic prophet, Levitical temple singers, and preachers, as well as wisdom teachers loyal to the law).[20] This view, however, cannot be demonstrated, due to the continuing lack of clarity concerning the significance the sacred rock has for the temple of Jerusalem,[21] and especially due to the absence of any unequivocal witnesses concerning its meaning during the pre-Israelite period. All the same, one cannot exclude in principle the possibility that some measure of influence has come from the cultic notions associated with the sacral tradition of the Jebusite sanctuary on Zion. An explanation for the address and designation of Yahweh as *sela'*, however, and for this circumscription of the sacred site with *ṣûr,* might more likely be found in the not unwarranted assumption that especially after the events of 701 B.C. (deliverance of Zion from the Assyrian attack) and 515 B.C. (dedication of the Second Temple after the exile), those in Jerusalem simply transferred in a purely metaphorical fashion the notion of a rock — one not at all unusual for Jerusalem as such — to Yahweh himself, and to his delivering power as manifested within the people of God.

III. LXX. The common equivalent for *sela'* in the LXX is *pétra,* a word that in secular Greek usually refers to a mature, firm rock. In its figurative meaning *pétra* similarly functions there as a symbol for firmness and immovability as well as for hardness of heart and lack of feeling.[22] The rendering of *sela'* with *krēmnós* (2 Ch. 25:12) and *leōpetría* (Ezk. 24:7f.; 26:4,14) is based apparently on some particular feature of the rock. Surprisingly, the translation of *sela'* as an address and designation for Yahweh is not *pétra* (the exception being 2 S. 22:2), but rather the variously elucidating expressions *steréōma* (Ps. 18:3[2]; 71:3), *krataíōma* (31:4[3]), and *antilḗmptōr* (42:10[9]). The background here is the attempt to avoid any misunderstanding of the rock as the seat of a deity or even as its embodiment, a misunderstanding quite possible in the Hellenistic world.[23]

IV. Qumran. The use of *sela'* in the writings of Qumran generally follows that in the OT. The depression in the mature *sela'* appears as a collecting pool for water (CD 10:12). The ordinance that on the sabbath a person may pick up neither *sela'* nor *'āpār* in his dwelling (CD 11:11) is apparently distinguishing between the contrasting pair "stone" and "earth."[24] Regarding God, petitioners confess that the way of their steps is on the *sela'* of the truth of God (1QS 11:4f.), that God has established the edifice (of the congregation) on *sela'* (1QH 7:8), and finally that God is the *sela'* of their strength (1QH 9:28).

Haag

---

20. See Eichhorn.
21. Cf. T. A. Busink, *Der Tempel von Jerusalem* (Leiden, 1970), 1-20.
22. Cullmann, *TDNT,* VI, 95f.
23. See Bertram.
24. E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, [2]1971), 89.

סָמַךְ sāmak̲; שְׂמִיכָה s^emîk̲â

Contents: I. Root and Cognates. II. Meaning of the Verb: 1. With the Accusative: "Support, Help"; 2. With *'al* (Intransitive): "Lean On, Attack"; 3. With the Accusative + *'al:* "Lean On, Place"; The Ritual Laying On of Hands; 4. Passive Participle *sāmûk̲;* 5. Niphal + *'al;* 6. Piel; 7. *s^emîk̲â;* 8. LXX; 9. Qumran.

I. Root and Cognates. This root occurs in the other Semitic languages with meanings similar to that in Biblical Hebrew: Akk. *samāku,* "cover over,"[1] with the related forms *samku,* "covered up," *simku* (?) and *sumuktu,* "covering";[2] Old Aram. *smk,* "support, prop up"; Palmyr. *smk',* "a support" (perhaps an altar base); Nab. and Palmyr. *smk',* "feast, banquet";[3] Jewish Aram. *s^emak̲,* "press on (hands), support, fit together";

---

sāmak̲. General: F. Stolz, "סמך *smk* to support," *TLOT,* II, 804-5.

On hand leaning: K. Bähr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus,* II (Heidelberg, 1839), 288-93, 304-7, 338-43; J. Behm, *Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum* (1911; repr. Darmstadt, 1968), 121ff.; M. Bernoulli, *Vocabulaire biblique* (Neuchâtel/Paris, 1954), 130f.; J. Coppens, *L'imposition des mains et les rites connexés dans le NT* (Paris, 1925); B. S. Easton, "Jewish and Early Christian Ordination," *ATR* 5 (1922f.) 308-19; 6 (1923f.) 285-95; P. A. Elderenbosch, *De Oplegging der Handen* (The Hague, 1953), 13-28; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I. BietOr* 18A (²1971), 140f.; H. Gese, "Die Sühne: Zur biblischen Theologie," *BEvT* 78 (1977), 85-106; B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. WMANT* 55 (1982), 199-221; H. Lesêtre, "Imposition des mains," *DB,* III (1903), 847-50; J. Licht, "סמיכה," *EMiqr,* V (1968), 1052-55; E. Lohse, *Die Ordination im Spätjudentum und im NT* (Göttingen, 1951), 19-27; J. A. MacCulloch, "Hand," *ERE,* VI (1913), 492-99; H. Mantel, "Ordination and Appointment in the Period of the Temple," *HTR* 57 (1964) 325-46; J. C. Matthes, "Der Sühnegedanke bei den Sündopfern," *ZAW* 23 (1903) 97-119; K. E. Mattingly, *The Laying On of Hands on Joshua* (diss., Andrews, 1997); A. Médebielle, *L'expiation dans l'AT* (Rome, 1924), 147-58; B. J. van der Merwe, "The Laying On of Hands in the OT," *OTWSA* 5 (1962) 34-43; A. Metzinger, "Die Substitutionstheorie und das alttestamentliche Opfer mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Lev 17,11," *Bibl* 21 (1940) 159-87, 247-72, 353-77; L. Moraldi, *Espiazione sacrificali e riti espiatori nell'ambiente biblico e nell'AT* (Rome, 1956), 253-61; J. Newman, *Semikhah [Ordination]: A Study of Its Origin, History and Function* (Manchester, 1950), 1-12; R. Péter, "L'imposition des mains dans l'AT," *VT* 27 (1977) 48-55; R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967), 92f., 214-16, 232; idem, "Zur Bedeutung der Handaufstemmung bei den Opfern," *Leviticus. BK* III/1 (1985), 32-48; A. Rothkoff, "Semikhah," *EncJud,* XIV (1972), 1140-47; M. C. Sansom, "Laying On of Hands in the OT," *ExpT* 94 (1982/83) 323-26; M. H. Shepherd, "Hands, Laying On of," *IDB,* II (1962), 521f.; H. P. Smith, "The Laying On of Hands," *AJT* 17 (1913) 47-62; R. de Vaux, *Studies in OT Sacrifice* (Cardiff, 1964), 28f.; P. Volz, "Die Handauflegung beim Opfer," *ZAW* 21 (1901) 93-100; S. Wefing, "Untersuchungen zum Entsühnungsritual am Grossen Versöhnungstag (Leviticus 16)" (diss., Bonn, 1979); H. D. Wendland, "Handauflegung," *RGG,* III (³1959), 53f.; D. P. Wright, "The Gesture of Hand Placement in the Hebrew Bible and in Hittite Literature," *JAOS* 106 (1986) 433-46.

1. *AHw,* II, 1017; differently in *CAD,* XV, 109, "to dam a canal."
2. *AHw,* II, 1058.
3. *DNSI,* II, 792.

Mand. *samka,* "support base";[4] Syr. *s^emak̲,* "lay on, support, oppress, etc."; *samkā',* "base, support, etc."; *s^emāk̲ā',* "feast, table fellowship";[5] Arab. *samaka,* "be highly exalted";[6] *samk,* "house roof, etc."; OSA *śmk,* "to support;[7] Eth. *'asmaka,* "lay on"; *s^emkat,* "act of leaning against"; *masmaka,* "base, support"; *m^esmak,* "place of leaning against."[8] Although the noun *smkt* does also occur in Ugaritic, its meaning there is unclear.[9]

II. Meaning of the Verb. The verb *sāmak̲* occurs 48 times in the OT, 41 of those in the qal (including the active and passive participles), 6 in the niphal, and 1 in the piel.[10] The noun *ś^emîk̲â* (a related form?) occurs once.[11] Finally, *sāmak̲* also occurs in the PNs *s^emak̲yāhû* (1 Ch. 26:7), *yismak̲yāhû* (2 Ch. 31:13), and *'ahîsāmāk̲* (Ex. 31:6; 35:34; 38:23). In each case the verbal element means "to help, support."[12] The meaning of the verb varies between "lean on" and "support," and the appropriate aspect emerges only through the accompanying substantives. Three different constructions of the verb (in the qal) with various nominal combinations exhibit this ambiguity. The verb is used (1) with the accusative; (2) intransitively without a direct object, though with the designation of place indicated by *'al;* (3) with a direct object and locative *'al.* The semantic distinction between the last two constructions is determined by *'al.*

Furthermore, *sāmak̲* exhibits semantic variations extending from physical supporting or leaning to the abstract notion of helping and sustaining. The concrete meanings of *sāmak̲* include: supporting someone who falls (Ps. 145:14); holding someone by the hand to prevent a fall (Ps. 37:24); leaning against or on something (pillars: Jgs. 16:29); relying on something (2 K. 18:21; Isa. 36:6; Am. 5:19); laying the hand on something.[13] This literal meaning can easily be used figuratively: to help, support morally. The niphal is abstracted to mean "depend on, trust in."[14]

1. *With the Accusative: "Support, Help."* Used with a direct object, *sāmak̲* means "support something or someone" in either the concrete or figurative sense (Gen. 27:37; Ps. 3:6[Eng. v. 5]; 51:14[12]; 119:116; Isa. 59:16; 63:5b). The active participle — used much more frequently nominally than participially — occurs as *nomen regens* in a genitive object construction (Ps. 37:17,24; 54:6[4]; Isa. 63:5a; Ezk. 30:6), and once in a construction circumscribing the genitive relationship with *sōmēk̲ l^e* (Ps. 145:14).

The relationship between God and a person can be described with *sāmak̲.*

---

4. *MdD,* 313.
5. *LexSyr,* 480.
6. Lane, 1430.
7. ContiRossini, 255.
8. *LexLingAeth,* 335f.
9. *KAI,* 1, 16, I, 35.
10. See, respectively, 1-4, 5, 6 below.
11. See 7 below.
12. Cf. *IPN,* 176.
13. See 3 below.
14. See 5 below.

a. God "supports all who are falling, and raises up *(zôqēp̄)* those who are bowed down" (Ps. 145:14). The falling person does not perish, because Yahweh steadies his hand (37:24).

b. A more abstract sense of "helping" is meant when God helps *('āzar)* and supports the oppressed petitioner (Ps. 54:6[4]). The wicked will perish (37:10,15,17,20) because Yahweh upholds the righteous (v. 17).

In interpersonal relationships *sāmak̲* occurs in Ezekiel in the sense "ally oneself." This book allows both the concrete sense "support" and the abstract sense "ally oneself" to resonate when he explains that "all who support Egypt shall fall" (30:6). On the one hand, the literal sense is underscored by *yārad̲* in the second half of the verse. The combination with the verb *nāp̄al* enables the prophet to employ a wordplay with the phrase *nāp̄al beḥereb̲* (vv. 4-6). On the other hand, the more abstract meaning is picked up by *'ôzēr* (v. 8).

Finally, *sāmak̲* also indicates that someone "helps" God. God trampled Edom's winepress, and no one was there to help him *('āzar)* or support him (*sāmak̲*, Isa. 63:5a) other than he himself: "So my own arm had to help me, and my wrath assisted me *(s^{e}māk̲āṯnî)*" (v. 5b). Similarly, in eliminating unrighteousness, Yahweh is assisted by his own "righteousness" (*s^{e}māk̲āṯhû*, 59:16). Here we find the parallel verbs → **פגע** *pāga'* hiphil, "intervene for someone," and → **ישע** *yš'*.

c. With God as its subject, *sāmak̲* also refers to the deliverance that comes when a person's life is threatened by death. The psalmist knows that even while he sleeps, Yahweh sustains him (Ps. 3:6[5]; an incubation oracle?). In 119:116 he asks for Yahweh's assistance (par. *'āzar*, v. 117) "that I may live."

d. The construction of *sāmak̲* with a direct object can be expanded by a second object (double accusative), with one object referring to the person who is supported, and the other substantively qualifying the manner of such support.[15]

Isaac explicates the blessing of Jacob: "I have supplied him *(s^{e}mak̲tîyw)* with grain and wine" (Gen. 27:37). A similar construction is found in Ps. 51:14(12): "Equip me *(tism^{e}uk̲ēnî)* with a willing spirit." The piel has a similar meaning.[16]

2. *With 'al (Intransitive): "Lean On, Attack."* Intransitive *sāmak̲* with *'al* occurs twice. Since contextually the reference is to enemies, one expects hostile connotations to attach to *sāmak̲ 'al* in the sense of "exert pressure on, attack." According to Ezk. 24:2, the Babylonian king exerts pressure on Jerusalem (*sāmak̲ 'el;* in Ezekiel *'el* is the equivalent of *'al*).[17] According to Ps. 88:8(7), the petitioner describes his suffering with the words, "your wrath lies heavy upon me."

3. *With the Accusative + 'al: "Lean On, Place."* With a direct object and locative *'al, sāmak̲* means "lean on" in the concrete sense, occurring exclusively in connection

15. Cf. *GK,* §§117ff.
16. Cf. 6 below.
17. Cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), on Ezk. 1:17.

with the ritual laying on of hands, the exception being Am. 5:1, where Amos describes in a metaphor the impossibility of fleeing the consequences of the day of Yahweh:[18] "As if a man fled from a lion, and a bear met him; or went into a house and leaned with his hand against the wall, and a serpent bit him."

Wright — Milgrom

The Ritual Laying On of Hands. The gesture of laying on hands (or better: hand leaning, since in the rabbinic view a person is to perform this gesture with considerable pressure) accompanies various ritual procedures.[19] Since the OT does not itself explain this gesture, various interpretations have been put forth in the history of scholarship, and can, according to J. Licht and R. Rendtorff, be classified as follows:

a. *Transference Hypothesis.* By means of this gesture, Moses transfers his authority to his successor, the priest transfers sins to the scapegoat, and the offerer transfers them to the sacrificial animal (Jewish tradition).[20] According to B. Janowski and Rendtorff *(Leviticus),* this hypothesis can now be accepted only in connection with the scapegoat rite, not in connection with sacrifice.

b. *Identification Hypothesis.* During hand leaning, a "transference of the offerer's own person to the animal"[21] takes place. According to H. Gese, expiation occurs "by the surrender of life on the part of the sacrificial animal identified with the directing participant through the laying on of hands."[22]

c. *Modified Representational Hypothesis.* B. Janowski begins with Noth and Gese in asserting that "the essential element in cultic representation is not transference . . of the *materia peccans* to a ritual bearer of sin and the following elimination of this bearer, but rather the symbolic surrender of life on the part of the *homo peccator* in the death of the sacrificial animal, into which the sinner is taken when he identifies with this creature through the laying on of hands."[23]

According to Rendtorff, although these hypotheses (which are frequently mixed) do provide a possible theory concerning the origin (*ḥaṭṭā't̲* sacrifice) and original meaning of the gesture, they cannot explain all its occurrences (e.g., with the *zeb̲aḥ-šᵉlāmîm*).[24] The explanation put forth by S. Wefing, that such hand leaning occurs for the purpose of holding the animal firm during the sacrificial procedure, can be noted as a curious special case.

---

18. → יוֹם *yôm* (VI, 7-32).

19. Cf. Bab. *Ḥag.* 16b; → יד *yād̲,* V, 423f.

20. See Volz; K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966); Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte;* K. Koch, "Sünde und Sündenvergebung um die Wende von der exilischen zur nachexilischen Zeit," *EvT* 26 (1966) 217-39; Medebielle, 147ff. See also discussion below on Moses.

21. M. Noth, *Leviticus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1965), 22; cf. also W. Robertson Smith, *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (New York, ³1927); A. Bertholet, *Leviticus. KHC* 3 (1901); R. K. Yerkes, *Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism* (New York, 1952); H. H. Rowley, "The Meaning of Sacrifice," *BJRL* 33 (1950/51) 76-78; R. Péter.

22. P. 197.

23. Pp. 215-21, quotation 220f.

24. *Leviticus,* 43.

d. *Declaration/Demonstration Hypothesis.* This hypothesis focuses on the sacrificial rite, explaining that the hand leaning is the offerer's declaration that the sacrificial animal is his possession that he is presenting to the deity in performing this sacrifice, and that the fruits of the sacrifice are to benefit him.[25] This is also the point of departure for the following discussion.

Fabry

e. The decisive elements for a new interpretation of the gesture of hand leaning are found in J. Milgrom's investigation of two types: (1) hand leaning with *two* hands (apart from the sacrificial ritual); and (2) hand leaning with *one* hand.[26] This distinction — not noted by Stolz — was worked out by R. Péter and then expressly appropriated by Janowski and Rendtorff. It can be consistently demonstrated, however, only in passages with a singular subject (12 of 23).

(1) Hand leaning carried out with two hands is principally a demonstrative gesture identifying the recipient or focal point of a ritual act. Thus at the scapegoat ritual, this gesture shows the goat upon which the sins are laid (*nāṯan,* Lev. 16:21). Aaron is to lay two hands on the goat that is to be sent into the desert to Azazel. Although the sins are indeed transferred here to the goat, it is not clear that this transference takes place through the hand leaning itself. A literally understood transference of sins through Aaron's hands is excluded by the fact that Aaron himself cannot be the bearer of sins. Rather, the sins, external to Aaron, come to rest upon the place designated by the hand placement.[27]

Through the laying on of hands, the authority of Moses is transferred to Joshua (Nu. 27:18,23; Dt. 34:9). Nu. 27:18 relates that Moses laid his hand (sg.) on Joshua, while according to v. 23 and Dt. 34:9 he lays both hands on him. Perhaps *ydk* in Nu. 27:18 is to be understood as the *scriptio defectiva* of a plural form (cf. LXX).[28] The practical result of transferring Moses' sovereignty[29] (Nu. 27:20) and the spirit of wisdom (Dt. 34:9) to Joshua, however, does not seem to happen through the laying on of hands itself, since these blessings do not flow over to Joshua "through the hand" of Moses. Rather, here, too, the laying on of hands serves to designate Joshua as the recipient of the rite before the priest and congregation. The words accompanying this gesture served the actual transference of the powers of office.

Jacob's laying on of hands on Joseph's sons is to be interpreted similarly with a blessing formula (Gen. 48:13ff.; they are appointed sons of Israel, v. 5), although here the verbs → שִׁית *šîṯ* (vv. 14,17) and → שִׂים *śîm* are used.

The gesture of laying both hands on the blasphemer is not quite clear; before his

---

25. Matthes; Eichrodt; Ringgren; L. Moraldi, *Espiazione sacrificale e riti espiatori. AnBibl* 5 (1956); and esp. de Vaux.

26. "Sacrifice and Offering," *IDBSup* (1976), 765.

27. Cf. D. Z. Hoffmann, *Leviticus,* I (Jerusalem, 1953) [Hebrew], 89 = *Das Buch Leviticus* (Berlin, 1905-6).

28. Cf. also Péter, 50f.

29. → הוד *hôḏ (hôdh)* (III, 352-56).

stoning, the witnesses are to lay their hands (pl.) on him (Lev. 24:14). This gesture has been frequently interpreted as the transference of the defilement, generated by the misuse of the divine name, from the listeners to the blasphemer. Others have interpreted the gesture as an act through which the witnesses unequivocally and legitimately declare the blasphemer guilty. The gesture thus implies the symbolic empowerment of their witness and of their responsibility for the execution of the delinquent. This legal interpretation seems to be the correct one for several reasons:

(a) The interpretation of the gesture as a transference of the defilement issues from the traditional transference hypothesis.

(b) No biblical passage suggests that the misuse of the divine name brings about defilement.

(c) At the stoning of an idolater, the witness had to cast the first stone (Dt. 17:7; cf. 13:10[9]). This refers to the extreme responsibility assumed by the witness in relation to the accused or condemned. According to Lev. 24, the guilty party is similarly led out of the camp, the witnesses lay their hands on him, and then the congregation stones him.

(d) Finally, the two elders accuse Susanna of adultery through a laying on of hands (Sus. 34 = Dan. 13:34 LXX), demonstrating that the late scribe of the Susanna narrative was familiar with the laying on of hands from Lev. 24 as a legal act.

(2) The laying on of only *one* hand (sg.) is a completely different gesture, and occurs only in connection with a sacrificial ritual (Lev. 1:4 [LXX 1:10]; 3:2,8,13; 4:4,24, 29,33). This laying on of one hand demonstrates that the sacrificial animal belongs to the offerer, and that the benefaction resulting from the sacrifice is to flow to this particular offerer. If several persons function as offerers, all are to lay their hand on the animal (Ex. 29:10,15,19; Lev. 4:15; 8:14,18,22; 2 Ch. 29:23). This rite is attested in connection with the private burnt, freewill, and sin offerings.[30] It is not mentioned in connection with the guilt offering, probably because the appropriate sacrificial animal could sooner be replaced by a money offering.[31] The hand leaning was similarly absent from both bird and grain sacrifices,[32] as well as at public community offerings (*tāmîḏ*, festival offering; cf. Mishnah *Men.* 9:7; but cf. also 2 Ch. 29:23); the exception here is the sin offering of the community (Lev. 4:13ff.). Immediately after bringing the sacrificial animal into the temple court (Mishnah *Kel.* 1:8) and before the slaughter, the offerer performed this rite (cf. Mishnah *Men.* 9:9).

Although some have supposed that this rite was accompanied by a confession of sin, this view is to be rejected. (a) The OT does not itself attest such a combination. (b) The combination of a laying on of hands (pl.!) and a confession of sin at the scapegoat rite (Lev. 16:21f.) cannot be adduced as evidence, since this is not a sacrifice. (c) Confessions are made before the sacrifice is initiated (Lev. 5:5; Nu. 5:7).[33] (d) The

---

30. → עולה *'ôlâ;* → זבח *zāḇaḥ (zābhach)* (IV, 8-29); → חטא *ḥāṭā' (chāṭā')* (IV, 309-19).

31. → אשם *'āšām ('āshām)* (I, 429-37). Cf. J. Milgrom, *Cult and Conscience* (Leiden, 1976), 15 n. 48.

32. See discussion below.

33. Moraldi, 258f.

frequently adduced substitution hypothesis is not a valid sacrificial theory for Israel.[34] It is possible, however, that at the hand leaning the offerer was accompanied by a declaration of the type of sacrifice for which the animal was brought.

It is doubtful that hand leaning should be explained by the substitution hypothesis as a transfer of sins from the offerer to the sacrificial animal, or as the transfer of the person and his emotions.[35] Hand leaning in connection with sacrifice instead functions to show the relationship between offerer and sacrificial animal. In laying on the hand, the offerer demonstrates that the sacrificial animal is *his* offering, that the priest presents the sacrifice in *his* name, and that the sacrificial benefits are to flow to *him*.[36] This laying on of the hand is obviously the only activity performed by the offerer apart from the preparation of the sacrificial animal, the result being that this rite constitutes the "signature" of the offerer, attributing the entire sacrificial procedure to him. This explains why such hand leaning is not part of the bird and grain offerings;[37] here the sacrificial offering remains in the hand of the offerer until the actual moment of offering itself, so that the personal relationship with the offerer remains continually visible.

The laying on of hands at the dedication of the Levites corresponds to that at sacrifice. The Levites are led into the sanctuary (*qrb* hiphil, Nu. 8:9) and brought before Yahweh (*qrb* hiphil, v. 10). Then the priests lay their hands on them (v. 10) and dedicate them before Yahweh as *t^enûpâ* (v. 11; cf. vv. 13,15).[38] Through this laying on of hands, the Israelites signal that the Levites are *their* gift (instead of the firstborn) to Yahweh.

Excursus. Hand laying among the Hittites exhibits essentially the same features.[39] The Hittite rite was performed only with one hand (*ŠU-an QATAM* or *QATIŠUNU,* in the sg.), which was laid on the sacrificial object or held "at some distance" *(tuwaz)* from it. This hand laying is found exclusively in the context of sacrifice, though not in

34. Cf. Metzinger.

35. Metzinger; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the OT. OTL,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans. 1961-67), I, 165f.; T. C. Vriezen, *An Outline of OT Theology* (Eng. trans., Oxford, 1958), 300f.; de Vaux, 28 n. 5. For the former transfer idea see Volz; Medebielle, 147ff.; Elliger, *Leviticus,* 34. For the latter see Lesêtra, 848; Moraldi, 262; Behm, 136ff.; Riehm; cf. Elderenbosch, 21.

36. Cf. de Vaux, 28f.

37. Cf. Péter, 52.

38. → נוף *nwp* (IX, 296-99).

39. *KBo,* IV, 9, ii, 51f. (cf. *ANET,* 359); *KUB,* XX, 83, iii, 10-12; iv, 8; XXV, 1, iii, 6f.; *KBo,* XI, 51, r. iv, 12f.; *StBoT,* 12, i, 51f.; ii, 1f., 7f., 19-21, 24f., 38f.; iii. 2'f.; *StBoT,* 13, i, 20f.; *Mastigga* (L. Rost, *MIO* 1 [1953] 345ff.) i, 18'; iii, 49-53, 54-58; *KBo,* II, 3, iii, 12-14 (cf. *ANET,* 351); *Ašḫella, KUB,* IX, 32+, vv. 18ff. (Ger. trans. of the most important parts by H. Kümmel, "Ersatzkönig und Sündenbock," *ZAW* 80 [1968] 310f.); O. R. Gurney, *Some Aspects of Hittite Religion* (Oxford, 1977), 48f.; "Muršilis Sprachlëhmung," *KBo,* IV, 2, iii, 54, 60; iv, 21 (ed. A. Goetze and H. Pedersen, *Muršilis Sprachlähmung* [Copenhagen, 1934]); *StBoT,* 25, p. 94, II, 1; p. 108, no. 46, 7'f.; p. 116, no. 52, i, 12'-14'; p. 150, no. 73, r. col. 4'; p. 169, no. 89, ii, 6'f.; p. 212, no. 127, r. ?iii, 8'; p. 213, no. 129, ii, 4'; p. 233, no. 147, r. ?12'; *KUB,* II, 13, ii, 49 (cited in *StBoT,* 12, 75); *Bo* 2708, i, 5ff. (cited ibid.); *KUB,* II, 15, v, 22.

connection with healings, blessings, or the transference of authority or sins. The hands are usually laid on foodstuffs that are to be offered, e.g., bread and cheese, which are then divided and assigned to various deities. Offerings also include wine and other drinks, which are then offered as libations.

The sequence of events demonstrates the significance of the Hittite hand laying. The king, a cult functionary, or a sick person laid his hands on the foodstuffs extended to them. Thereafter a cult servant attended to the division, libation, or distribution. Hence here, too, the hand laying functions to demonstrate the relationship between the sacrificial materials and the offerer, so that the other parts of the rite could be carried out by cult servants. The hand laying in "Mursilis's Speech Impediment" text and in the Ašḫella ritual has the same purpose. Mursilis lays his hand on the sacrificial bull in order to document it as his own, since he is unable to be present at the actual sacrificial event. In the Ašḫella plague ritual, an officer lays his hands on the sacrificial he-goats and petitions that the deity responsible for the plagues might accept these animals.[40] Since nothing here suggests a transference of sins, this, too, involves a documentation rite.

4. *Passive Participle sāmûk̲.* The meaning of the pass. ptcp. *sāmûk̲* deviates from that of the verb itself: "firm, steadfast, secure." God's precepts are constant *(ne'ᵉmānîm),* they are established forever *(sᵉmûk̲îm),* are performed in faithfulness *(be'ᵉmet̲),* and are upright *(yāšār)* (Ps. 111:7-8). The heart of the righteous is undeterred *(nāk̲ôn)* and trusting *(bōṭēaḥ)* in Yahweh, i.e., it is steadfast *(sāmûk̲)* (112:7f.). The meaning is similar in the victory song in Isa. 26:1-6: "You keep him in perfect peace whose mind is steady *(yēṣer sāmûk̲),* because he trusts in you."

5. *Niphal + 'al.* The niphal *nismak̲ 'al* corresponds to *sāmak̲* + object in the reflexive/passive sense. The concrete meaning occurs in Jgs. 16:29, where Samson grasps the pillars of the Philistine temple and then leans against them, causing them to collapse (v. 30). Isa. 36:6 par. 2 K. 18:21 compares Egypt with a broken reed that pierces the hand of the person who leans on it. The Israelites "steady themselves" on God (Isa. 48:2). The people "trust in" Hezekiah's words (2 Ch. 32:8). According to 11QPs^a XIX, 13, the suppliant steadies himself on God's demonstration of grace.

6. *Piel.* The piel *simmēk̲* is found only in Cant. 2:5, where it exhibits a meaning similar to *sāmak̲* in Gen. 27:37, "sustain." In contrast to the latter passage, however, the verb is used here with instrumental *bᵉ*.

7. *śᵉmîk̲â.* The noun *śᵉmîk̲â* cannot be definitely associated with *sāmak̲*.[41] In Jgs. 4:18 Jael covers Sisera with his *śᵉmîk̲â*. Targ.^{J} has *gûnkā',* "bed cover"; LXX^A has *dérris,* "leather cover"; LXX^B has *epibólaion,* "garment, clothing"; while the Vulg. has

40. Cf. the text in Kümmel, "Ersatzkönig und Sündenbock"; and Janowski, 211.
41. Cf. *KBL²*, 925; *HAL,* III, 1337.

pallium, "garment, clothing," which may well involve a misreading of *m*ᵉ*suk̲â*. It may be present with the same meaning in 4Q167 (4QpHos[b]) 3:3 (?).

Wright — Milgrom

8. *LXX.* The LXX uses a whole series of words in rendering this root. As regards the qal, the dominant verb is *epitithénai* (21 occurrences), which otherwise is used for both *śîm* and *nāṯan,* though also for *nûp* in the interesting passage 2 K. 5:11, the only time such laying on of hands is associated with healing a sick person.[42] In 10 instances the LXX uses *stērízein* + compounds, similarly also in all niphal and piel passages. The most similar to *sāmak̲* semantically, it refers in the figurative sense to a "firm, unalterable purpose."[43]

9. *Qumran.* The term *sāmak̲* occurs about 20 times in Qumran, in the scrolls from 1Q almost exclusively in the passive participle in the expression *yēṣer sāmûk̲* in reference to the firm steadfastness of the Qumran Essene (1QS 4:5; 8:3; 10:25; 1QH 1:35; 2:9 [opposite *nimh*ᵃ*rê lēḇ*],36 [opposite *hôlāl*]).[44] In 1QM 8:7,14, *sāmûk̲* is used in a characterization of the "sustained tone" of the eschatological trumpets. Among the finite verb forms (qal), the subject is almost exclusively God, who upholds the teacher (1QH 2:7, par. *ʿāmaḏ* hiphil) through an outpouring of his holy spirit (7:6), through truth (9:32) and might (18:13). In the *eschaton* he will uphold the returning David (4QpIsa[a] 4:2). The inclusion of the verb in a gesture of hand leaning is not attested, a situation commensurate with the overall character of Qumran-Essene ritual. The citation of an OT sacrificial rite is perhaps present in 11QT 15:18, which anticipates hand leaning by the elders of the priests (at the consecratory feast after New Year). Here, as in 1Q22 4:9, the context is disrupted. The occurrence in 1QapGen 20:22,29 is especially interesting, since hand leaning occurs in connection with the healing of a sick person, thus possibly providing a linguistic model for NT usage.[45]

Fabry

---

42. → יד *yāḏ,* V, 423f.

43. G. Harder, "στηρίζω," *TDNT,* VII, 653-57, esp. 656; cf. G. Schneider, "στηρίζω," *EDNT,* III, 276.

44. On this contrast cf. H. Bardtke, "Acedia in Qumran," *Qumran-Probleme. DAWB* (Berlin, 1963), 29-51.

45. See 8 above. Cf. Fitzmyer, 140; → יד *yāḏ,* V, 423f.

סָעַד sāʿaḏ; מִסְעָד misʿāḏ

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences, Meaning. III. OT: 1. General; 2. Specific. IV. LXX and Vulgate. V. *misʿāḏ*.

•

I. Etymology. The root *sʿd* is also commonly used in Middle Hebrew. Outside Hebrew it occurs esp. in Aramaic, e.g., in Biblical Aramaic (Ezr. 5:2), already Ya'udi, as well as in Aramaic personal names, Egyptian Aramaic, and Jewish Aramaic.[1] Aramaic is probably the provenance of Akk. *sêdu* and *sa'du* I.[2] In the Behistun inscription Akk. *sêdu* is the equivalent of Aram. *sʿd*. Its relationship with Ugar. *sʿd* is undecided.[3] The root also occurs in Samaritan, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, and Nabatean.[4] Several of the homophonous roots have a special meaning, e.g., Mand. (cf. Arab.) *sa'ad,* "happy, fortunate."[5] Related words include OSA *sʿd,* "grant a favor," Arab. *saʿida* III, "help, support," IV, "make happy, help," and Tigre *saʿd,* "happiness."[6]

II. Occurrences, Meaning. The Hebrew verb *sāʿaḏ* occurs 12 times in the OT, exclusively in the qal. Occurrences can be classified into two groups. The word is used 7 times with the general meaning "support, strengthen, help," and then 5 times in a more specific sense, including 4 (Gen. 18:5; Jgs. 19:5,8; Ps. 104:15) with the obj. *lēḇ* in the expression "fortify one's heart" = "eat," and once without any object (1 K. 13:7) in the sense of "strengthen, fortify oneself" = "eat, refresh." In Biblical Aramaic, *sʿd* occurs in Ezr. 5:2 in the pael pl. ptcp. in the sense of "support, strengthen, help."

III. OT.

1. *General.* The use of *sʿd* in the first group (Isa. 9:6[Eng. v. 7]; Ps. 18:36[35]; 20:3[2]; 41:4[3]; 94:18; 119:117; Prov. 20:28) is fairly uniform. The word always occurs in verse. It is also noteworthy that every form has what may be called a venerable

---

sāʿaḏ. C. F. Barth, *Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage- und Dankliedern des ATs* (Zollikon, 1947), 136f.; W. Beyerlin, *Die Rettung der Bedrängten in den Feindpsalmen der Einzelnen auf institutionelle Zusammenhänge untersucht* (Göttingen, 1970), 32, 75ff.; F. Stolz, "סמך *smk* to support," *TLOT,* II, 804f.; R. Weiss, "Textual Notes," *Textus* 6 (1968) 130.

1. See, respectively, *KAI,* 214:15, 21; R. Degen et al., *Neue Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik,* 2 vols. (Wiesbaden, 1972-74), II, 67f. (cf. *HAL,* II, 761); *DNSI,* II, 795; Beyer, 647; and 1QapGen 22:31.

2. *AHw,* II, 1034, 1002.

3. *HAL,* II, 761, treats them together; a different view is taken by K. Aartun, "Beiträge zum ugaritischen Lexikon," *WO* 4 (1967/68) 295; J. C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Baʿlu. AOAT* 16 (1971), 69 (with bibliog.), is undecided. Otherwise, Ugar. *sʿd* is associated with Arab. *sʿd* and *sāda* II, *sayyid.*

4. J. Cantineau, *Le Nabatéen* II (Osnabruck, 1978), 152f.

5. *MdD,* 313.

6. ContiRossini, 198b; Biella, 339f.; Wehr, 374; *WbTigr,* 195a.

subject, though given the small number of occurrences one cannot conclude with any certainty that other types of subjects were not also common; in any event, in the Psalms it is always Yahweh (or, in direct address to him, "your right hand" in Ps. 18:36[35] and "your steadfast love" in 94:18), in Isa. 9:6(7) the promised ruler, and in Prov. 20:28 the king. It does seem, however, that this word was most often used in elevated style.

The verb has two different kinds of objects. (a) In Ps. 18:36(35) and 20:3(2) it is the king, in Prov. 20:28 his throne, and in Isa. 9:6(7) his rule. (b) In Ps. 41:4(3); 94:18; 119:117 it is the petitioner in need to whom Yahweh turns his attention or who entreats Yahweh to do so.

The OT attests only figurative usage with regard to the basic meaning "support, assist." It is unclear to what extent a concrete image of support still resonated or could yet be sensed; perhaps this was still evoked by the notion of supporting or upholding the throne in Prov. 20:28,[7] by that of the king being supported by Yahweh's right hand in Ps. 18:36(35), or by the slipping foot in Ps. 94:18. In its purely figurative use, the verb's meaning is substantively shaped by the various kinds of "supporting," and in summary it might best be rendered by "support" in the sense of "strengthen, help," with the meaning "strengthen" also applying to the more specific usage discussed below.

Whereas in each of the passages from the Psalms it is always a person (the king, someone in need) who is supported or assisted, in Isa. 9:6(7) and Prov. 20:28 it is the king's rule or his throne. Isa. 9:6(7) promises that "there shall be endless peace for the throne of David and his kingdom," and then with the following two infs. *kwn* and *s'd* (with *l*^{e}) explains how and in what way this will be done;[8] all this will happen because the king "establishes and upholds" his throne and rule "with justice and with righteousness." This "establishing and upholding," stability and steadfastness (*sā'aḏ* also expresses this aspect), are the essential promises needed for successful rule (2 S. 7:16; 1 K. 2:12,45). Similarly, tradition also held that *ṣ*^{e}*ḏāqâ* (→ צדק) and → משפט *mišpāṭ* were appropriate means of establishing and preserving one's rule (cf. Ps. 89:15[14]; also 97:2; Prov. 16:12; Jer. 23:5; 33:15; no distinction need be made between the throne of God and the king).[9] In Prov. 20:28 the king upholds his throne through *ḥeseḏ* (LXX *en dikaiosýnē*). Although in both Isa. 9:6(7) and Prov. 20:28 *sā'aḏ* is used with *kwn* (a word actually more common in this particular context) and thus often translated as "establish,"[10] its meaning here is more likely "uphold, stabilize, strengthen" (cf. by contrast the translation of → כון *kwn* with "foundation").[11]

Twice in the Psalms the person thus supported or upheld is the king (18:36[35];

---

7. Cf. the supporting figures in connection with thrones in M. Metzger, *Königsthron und Gottesthron. AOAT* 15/1-2 (1985), I, 210f., pl. 100A, no. 1019 and C and D; → VII, 250.

8. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 405.

9. → כסא *kissē'* (VII, 232-59). Concerning this tradition, cf. also the Egyptian representations of the throne on the *mꜣ't* hieroglyph, H. Brunner, "Gerechtigkeit als Fundament des Thrones," *VT* 8 (1958) 426-28; cf. also the two *ma'at* figures standing behind the throne, Metzger, *Königsthron und Gottesthron,* I, 89; II, 78f., no. 271.

10. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 239.

11. → VII, 100f.

20:3[2]). Scholars generally view the middle part of 18:36(35), *wîmîn^{e}ḵā tis'āḏēnî,* as an addendum, since it does not occur in 2 S. 22:36.[12] The addendum is probably playing off the description of the king as a warrior such that the (concrete) image is evoked; "your right hand supports me," i.e., it holds me up, strengthens me. In Ps. 20:3(2) the petition "may he give you support from Zion" refers to help, assistance, and protection for the king (cf. the parallel first half of the verse, "may he send you help from the sanctuary," and the parallel preceding verse).

In Ps. 41:4(3); 94:18; 119:117, *sā'aḏ* takes the oppressed individual as its object and refers to a more comprehensive notion of helping. In 41:4(3) Yahweh sustains the sick individual, i.e., he helps that person through illness, strengthens, and heals the person (cf. the parallel second half of the verse). In 94:18 the context specifies even more clearly that Yahweh's intervention and help will rescue the oppressed person from the evildoers and thus from death (v. 17). When danger arises, Yahweh's steadfast love holds him up (cf. the parallel v. 19; concerning *ḥeseḏ,* cf. Prov. 20:28, where the king upholds his own through *ḥeseḏ*). "What the speaker recounts in vv. 18f. of this psalm sounds less like a reference to a single, comprehensive divine deed at a critical hour than to a recurring situation of help and support in ongoing distress." "This is apparently referring to ongoing support in getting through a difficult situation."[13]

In Ps. 119:117 the plea "hold me up" means "keep, support, strengthen, and help me." The result of that would be the petitioner's safety (*yš'* niphal). Here, too, the reference is to ongoing assistance and deliverance in life (the preceding v. 116 uses *sāmaḵ* in a parallel way, the anticipated result being a similar preservation of life). In this sense *sā'aḏ* can refer to diverse and more comprehensive help in life.

Parallels to *sā'aḏ* thus include both *šālaḥ 'ēzer* (Ps. 20:3[2]) and *sāmaḵ* (119:116); the remaining parallel clauses illuminate the meaning of *sā'aḏ* through their content (help and healing in 41:4[3], help in 18:36[35]).

In Ezr. 5:2 Biblical Aramaic uses *sā'aḏ* (with *l^e*) to refer to the support and help the prophets Haggai and Zechariah give to Jeshua and Zerubbabel in rebuilding the temple.

2. *Specific.* Among the 5 occurrences of *sā'aḏ* with specific meaning (Gen. 18:5; Jgs. 19:5,8; Ps. 104:15; 1 K. 13:7), 4 use *lēḇ* as the object; the image emerges of "strengthening, sustaining the heart" as an expression for "eating, refreshing oneself," one used elliptically is 1 K. 13:7 (i.e., *sā'aḏ* without *lēḇ* or any other object; but *sā'aḏ* might have the meaning "strengthen = eat, refresh oneself," even without being inserted in a fixed expression). In the expression "sustain, strengthen the heart," the *lēḇ* doubtless represents a person's entire vegetative system and vital energy.[14] Hence Gen. 18:5 (and by extension Jgs. 19:5,8 as well) is better translated "refresh yourselves" than "strengthen your heart." It is especially before or after a strenuous journey that one is called to "fortify your heart" in this sense (Gen. 18:5; Jgs. 19:5,8), the means of

12. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 255.
13. Beyerlin, 32; cf. also Barth, 136.
14. → VII, 413f.; *TLOT,* II, 640f.

such fortification being bread (*leḥem,* Gen. 18:5; Jgs. 19:5; Ps. 104:15), something God bestows through nature (Ps. 104:14). As such, part of his creation and a fundamental condition for human life is that "bread fortifies a person's heart," i.e., gives the person the requisite physical-spiritual energy for life (cf. 1 K. 21:7).

IV. LXX and Vulgate. The LXX renders *sā'aḏ* with *antilambánesthai* (Isa. 9:6[7]; Ps. 18:36[35]; 20:3[2]), *perikykloún* (Prov. 20:28), and *boēthein* (Ps. 41:4[3]; 94:18; 119:117). One can see that the first 3 passages use a graphic verb, while the psalms generally understand the notion of sustaining or supporting the oppressed as a form of helping. "Fortifying the heart" is translated with *phagein* (Gen. 18:5), *stērízein (tḗn) kardían* (Jgs. 19:5,8; Ps. 104:15), while 1 K. 13:7 uses *aristán.*

For the first group, the Vulg. uses 5 different words: *roborare* (Prov. 20:28; Ps. 20:3); *corroborare* (Isa. 9:6[7]); *confortare* (Ps. 18:36[35]; 41:4[3]); *adiuvare* (94:18); and *auxiliari* (119:117), understanding *sā'aḏ* thus in the sense of "fortify, help." The remaining passages translate *sā'aḏ lēḇ* with *confortare cor* (Gen. 18:5); *confortare stomachum* (Jgs. 19:5); *paululum cibi capere* (Jgs. 19:8); *confirmare cor* (Ps. 104:15); and *sā'aḏ* in 1 K. 13:7 with *prandere.*

V. *mis'āḏ.* Presumably a *terminus technicus, mis'āḏ* occurs only in 1 K. 10:12 and cannot be interpreted with any certainty. Imported almug wood (v. 11) was used to make musical instruments (lyres and harps) for the singers and *mis'āḏ* for the temple and palace. Even if vv. 11f. are secondary, they still assume that *mis'āḏ* and instruments made from this wood could be found in Jerusalem.[15] The parallel verse in 2 Ch. 9:11 mentions *m^esillâ,* "(raised) highway," 1 Ch. 26:16,18 a ramp on the west side of the temple, though the meaning of this architectural term is still uncertain (LXX renders the *m^esillôṯ* of 2 Ch. 9:11 as *anabáseis,* Vulg. as *gradus*). The LXX translates *mis'āḏ* as *hypostērígmata* (underprops? in 1 K. 7:24 *p^eqā'îm* is also translated with this word, referring to gourd-shaped ornaments). The Vulg. reads *fulcra* (neuter pl.). Jewish commentators understand *mis'āḏ* as "inlaid pavement" (*riṣpâ,* so Rashi), as "pillars supporting the beams," or as "ceiling" (Kimchi), though also as "landing" (*ma^{ʿa}qeh,* Levi ben Gershom).[16]

All these explanations are probably based on the given context or on the parallel verse 2 Ch. 9:11. No combination with the etymological interpretation provides more certainty. Some suggest emending the text to read *miṣ'āḏ,* "footpath."[17] The exact meaning thus remains uncertain.

A preliminary translation of *mis'āḏ* might be "paneling, wainscot"; a kind of paneling or external coating without any supportive function might also be so designated. In that case *m^esillâ* would be a covered surface functioning as a path. This might also be

---

15. Concerning almug wood, cf. also M. Noth, *Könige 1–16. BK* IX/1 (²1983), 227f.; J. C. Greenfield and M. Mayrhofer, "The *'algummîm/'almuggîm*-Problem Reexamined," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 83-89.

16. Cf. in this connection Weiss, 130.

17. So Weiss, 130, following W. Mayer.

suggested by the kind of wood mentioned,[18] though in that case this could only be referring to a limited and subsequent architectural measure, since chs. 6 and 7 "nowhere mention the use of almug wood." Is the reference then to furnishings of some sort instead?[19]

Warmuth

---

18. Cf. J. A. Montgomery and H. S. Gehman, *A Critical and Exegetical Comm. on the Books of Kings. ICC* (1951), 219.
19. Cf. Noth, *Könige 1–16,* 228.

סָעַר *sāʿar;* סַעַר *saʿar;* סְעָרָה *s^{e}ʿārâ;* שָׂעַר *śāʿar* II; שַׂעַר *śaʿar;* שְׂעָרָה *ś^{e}ʿārâ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology and Occurrences; 2. Syntax; 3. Meteorology; 4. LXX. II. Meteorological Phenomena in Theological Statements: 1. Metaphors; 2. Rapture; 3. Theophany; 4. Holy War.

I. 1. *Etymology and Occurrences.* The verb *sāʿar* probably derives from a Paleo-Semitic root *śʿr,* one nominally attested in the oldest occurrences. Akk. *šāru,* "wind, breath,.breeze," though also "nothing, nothingness, lie,"[1] might be an onomatopoetic construction attempting to imitate the blowing of the wind. For phonetic reasons the word cannot correspond to Heb. *saʿar.* The root is attested in West Semitic in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Mandaic.[2] Although *HAL* adduces Arab. *saʿara,* "to kindle," VII "go crazy," VIII "flare up, ignite," *suʿr,* "insanity, frenzy," this is doubtful because it has *s* instead of the anticipated *š*.[3] By contrast, the root was probably also appropriated as a loanword from Egyptian onomastics, as shown by the PN *yasʿar-kuna,* "it storms on . . ." in the Execration Texts.[4] Since the root is quite poorly attested outside Hebrew, any attempt at derivation remains questionable, including that of Gesenius, who asso-

---

sāʿar. M. Dahood, "*śʿrt,* 'Storm' in Job 4:15," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 544f.; J. Jeremias, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung. WMANT* 10/2 (1977); H. Lugt, "Wirbelstürme im AT," *BZ,* N.S. 19 (1975) 195-204; L. Schmidt, *De Deo: Studien zur Literarkritik und Theologie. BZAW* 143 (1976), 65.

1. *AHw,* III, 1192f.
2. Cf. Beyer, 647, "storm-driven"; itpael, "explode in flight"; *MdD,* 314, "be terrified, troubled, awestruck."
3. *HAL,* II, 762; cf. Wehr, 411.
4. Cf. A. Goetze, "Remarks on Some Names Occurring in the Execration Texts," *BASOR* 151 (1958) 32.

ciates *s/ś'r* with *ś'r* I, "shudder," which for *s'r* yields something like "dreadful, ghastly weather."[5] Barth located the etymon in Arab. *šġr,* "take away," whence the meaning "storm" might then be derived.[6]

Within Hebrew-Aramaic, *ś'r* is probably the earliest form; although the 4 occurrences of the verb (Ps. 50:3; 58:10[Eng. v. 9]; Job 27:21; Dnl. 11:40) and those of the noun forms (*śa'ar,* Isa. 28:2; *śe'ārâ,* Nah. 1:3; Job 9:17) are of differing ages, they are on the whole quite recent. An additional older feminine form ending in *-t* and postulated for Job 4:15 has not been demonstrated.[7] Context suggests that this is actually a form of *śa'ᵃrâ,* "hair."

The historically more recent form *s'r* occurs 8 times as a verb (including Job 15:30 conj., the first occurrence probably being Hos. 13:3 [between 725 and 722], though here, too, the overwhelming majority of witnesses is postexilic). As a noun, *sa'ar* occurs 8 times (definitely preexilic) and *se'ārâ* 21 times (including Ps. 55:9[8] conj., and Sir. 48:12; largely exilic and postexilic).

The Hebrew ostracon Arad 31:4 contains the PN *s'ryhw,* to be interpreted according to A. Lemaire as "YHWH has violently stirred up, has provoked the tempest."[8] Among the 3 occurrences in Qumran, in 1QH 5:18 the teacher praises God because he has "changed the tempest *(s'rh)* to a breeze *(dmmh),*" a metaphor for the repulsion of distress (cf. 1QH 3:6; cf. also Ps. 107:29). 11QtgJob 39:26 (Aram.) asks, "is the hawk startled up at your wisdom?" (par. *gāḇâ* hithpael, "raise, lift oneself up").

2. *Syntax.* Neither the verbs nor the nouns exhibit any noteworthy construction peculiarities. The verb *sā'ar,* "to storm" (also in the military sense; cf. Hab. 3:14; Dnl. 11:40) occurs in the qal, niphal ("become troubled," 2 K. 6:11), piel ("blow away, snatch away"),[9] and pual; additionally, *śā'ar* occurs in the hithpael. The activity described by the verbs is not restricted to specific subjects. The niphal in Ps. 50:3, "it storms, is tempestuous" (NRSV "a mighty tempest all around him") is to be understood as *passivum divinum.*[10] In several passages the nouns enter into construct associations: *rûaḥ se'ārâ* (Ps. 107:25; 148:8; Ezk. 1:4); *rûaḥ se'ārôṯ* (Ezk. 13:11); *sā'ar bela',* "storm of destruction" (Ps. 55:10[9], conj.); *sa'ᵃrôṯ têmān,* "whirlwinds of the south" (Zec. 9:14), and *sa'ᵃraṯ YHWH* (Jer. 23:19; 30:23). Interpretive difficulties attach to the *śa'ar qāṭeḇ,* "disastrous storm," in Isa. 28:2.[11]

The noun *sa'ar* is the subject of the following verbs: *hāyâ,* "come to be"; *yāṣa',* "come out, go forth"; *ḥwl,* "roar over"; *'wr* II, "be roused, get going"; and *gwr* hithpael

---

5. *GesB,* 790.
6. J. Barth, *Wurzeluntersuchungen zum hebräischen und aramäischen Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1902), 50.
7. Cf. Dahood; see also idem, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography X," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 401.
8. A. Lemaire, *Inscriptions hébraïques I: Les ostraca* (Paris, 1977), 200.
9. See *HP,* 200.
10. A different view is taken by Dahood, *Bibl* 53 (1972) 400f.
11. Cf. *HAL,* III, 1092.

(Jer. 30:23, disputed meaning). A *s^e'ārâ* can *'āmad,* "get up, arise," *bô',* "come," *bāqa',* "break forth," *nāśā',* "carry away," and *pwṣ* hiphil, "blow away."

3. *Meteorology.* A whole series of parallels indicates that *sa'ar* is a meteorological term. Its immediate environment includes *gešem,* "rain shower," and *bārāḏ/'elgāḇîš,* "hailstones" (Ezk. 13:11); *šeleg,* "snow," and *qîṭôr,* "thick smoke" (Ps. 148:8); *'āḇ/'ānān,* "cloud," and *qešet,* "rainbow" (Sir. 43:11); though also *sûpâ,* "storm" (Am. 1:14); *šā'ag* and *šā'ôn,* "thunder and roaring" (Jer. 25:30-32); and *bārāq,* "lightning" (Zec. 9:14). These are joined by less specific designations such as *qôl gāḏôl,* "loud sound"; *'ēš,* "fire"; and *lahaḇ/lehāḇâ,* "flame." Synonyms include the various designations for "wind": *nepeš, rûaḥ, rûaḥ zal'āpâ,* "raging storm" (Ps. 11:6; Sir. 43:17); *sûpâ* and *ra'aš,* all of which can be specified more closely (mythologically?) through indications of direction or provenance: *ṣāpôn,* "north"; *qāḏîm,* "south"; *têmān,* "southern area"; *rûaḥ yām,* "west wind"; *qeṭeḇ,* "demon of destruction" (?), etc. The ultimate antonym is dead calm.[12] This meteorological word field is transferred more or less in its entirety into descriptions of theophany.[13]

4. *LXX.* The broadly developed Greek vocabulary for the meteorological phenomenon "wind" corresponds to the numerous variations of this phenomenon in the partly subtropical climatic conditions of the eastern Mediterranean. In Semitic terminology differentiation in this sense is prompted less by phenomenological description than by other aims.[14] Greek is entirely different in this respect. Because its different terms stand for different phenomena, the LXX's extraordinarily varied rendering of *s'r* is to be taken as a differentiated interpretation, and a summary enumeration of the Greek "equivalents" is thus moot.

The LXX understands 2 K. 2:1,11; Jer. 23:19; Nah. 1:3 *(sysseismós)* and Jer. 25:32; Job 38:1; Sir. 48:9,12 *(laílaps)* to refer to the powerful and impressive upward suction in a whirlwind. By contrast, although the fiery phenomena in Ezk. 1:4 instead suggest a cyclone with electrical discharges, the LXX speaks of a relatively mild *pneûma exaíron.* But Aquila emends this into *prēstḗr,* the term for the most catastrophic form of "waterspout."[15] This deviation in Ezk. 1:4, however, actually derives from the linguistic tendency of the translator himself, who renders all occurrences of *s'r* in Ezekiel in this way (cf. also 13:11,13). The most frequent translation is *kateigís* (10 occurrences, 7 in the Psalms), which according to Lugt refers to the winds at the beginning stages of a whirlwind.[16] Other renderings include *klýdōn,* "wave, surge" (only in Jon. 1:4,12), associated with the relatively weak verb *exegeírē* (1:11,13). Speculative implications attach to the singular renderings *gnóphos,* "darkness" (Job 9:17); *néphos,* "cloud, mass of clouds" (Job 40:6); *seismós,* "earthquake, storm" (Jer. 23:19; cf. the verbal rendering in Am.

12. → דמה II, *d^eāmâ,* III, 264f.
13. See II.3.
14. See I.3.
15. Cf. Aristotle *Meteor.* 371a.
16. "Wirbelstürme," 200.

1:14); and *sálos,* "torrent, surge" (Zec. 9:14), while theological implications attach to *orgḗ,* "anger, wrath" (Jer. 30:23). The verb was understood as a verb of movement or transport: *ekkinéō, ekbállō, ekpíptō;* both *seísmō,* "to storm, charge" (Hab. 3:14), and *likmáō,* "winnow, fan" (Job 27:21), better approximate the basic meaning.[17]

II. Meteorological Phenomena in Theological Statements. Because meteorological phenomena are nowhere portrayed merely for the sake of scientific aims, even the completely realistic description of the mighty sea storm in Jonah 1 is already referring metaphorically to Yahweh's theophany. Yahweh casts a *rûaḥ g^{e}ḏôlâ* upon the sea (v. 4aα), whereupon a *sa'ar gāḏôl,* a "mighty storm," arises (v. 5aβ), breaking up *(šbr)* and sinking *('bd)* ships (vv. 4b,6). Here *sa'ar* is understood wholly as a water phenomenon that can come "upon" *('al)* someone (v. 12). The sea becomes increasingly stormy (*hōlēḵ w^{e}sō'ēr,* vv. 11,13),[18] but can in a reverse fashion also become calm again (*šāṯaq,* v. 11) and cease to rage (*zā'ap̄,* v. 15).

1. *Metaphors.* Whereas → סופה *sûp̄â* refers metaphorically to the rapidity of a procedure,[19] *sa'ar* indicates a danger deriving from something unstable, something from which people want to save themselves (*plṭ,* Ps. 55:9f.[8f.]). Hosea was already comparing both those who serve idols and the idols themselves with that which is completely unstable, namely, with the dew and with dissipating smoke (Hos. 13:3). The lot of the wicked is similarly understood; they will sway or rock like a boat in a storm (Sir. 33:2) that lifts them up and sweeps them away (Job 27:21). The wind even sweeps away the wicked's fruit (Job 15:30, emended text). In his own message of salvation, Deutero-Isaiah applies this image to Jerusalem: "O afflicted one, storm-tossed, and not comforted" (Isa. 54:11; cf. the interesting misreading in 1QIsa^a: *s^{e}ḥûrâ,* "the one purchased [by traders]"). Zec. 7:14 understands the exile as punishment, since Yahweh has scattered Israel "among all the nations that they had not known."[20]

2. *Rapture.* The OT speaks 4 times about Elijah's rapture *bas^e'ārâ,* "in/by the (!) whirlwind" (2 K. 2:11; v. 1 is secondary; Sir. 48:9,12 refers to this passage). The definite article attaching to *s^e'ārâ* here is striking[21] and can be taken as evidence that the author was picking up this *s^e'ārâ* as a familiar theophanic motif. The coupling of this word with the *reḵeḇ 'ēš,* "chariot of fire," and the *sûsê 'ēš,* "horses of fire," reflects the ancient oriental notion of the ascension of various deities in a tempest or whirlwind.[22] The transference of this notion to Elijah does not articulate any polemic against the gods (cf. the par. *rûaḥ YHWH* in v. 16); rather, it documents in a positive fashion the exceptional status of

---

17. Cf. G. Bornkamm, *TDNT,* IV, 280f.
18. Concerning this construction, cf. *GK,* §113u; *Synt,* §93g.
19. Cf. Lugt, 201.
20. Concerning the Aramaism *'ēsā'^{a}rēm,* cf. *GK,* §§23h, 52n.
21. Unless one accepts the explanation in *GK,* §126n.
22. Cf. Jeremias, 76ff.; A. Schmitt, *Entrückung, Aufnahme, Himmelfahrt. FzB* 10 (1973), 108f.

this great prophet, something also indicated by the strongly formulaic language in the passage as well as the historical influence of motifs from the Moses tradition.[23]

3. *Theophany.* The storm wind or whirlwind is a consistent motif in theophany portrayals. Yahweh's coming is accompanied by numinous and cosmic phenomena constituting fixed motif grouping in the portrayals, groups whose provenance in ancient oriental mythologies J. Jeremias has thoroughly discussed.[24] One significant feature here is the transference of earlier mythologems concerning the weather god to Yahweh (cf. Ps. 18).[25] Such portrayals of theophanies with metaphors of storm and thunder were a widespread form in Israel and were possibly already incorporated into the cult at an early period. But it is striking that the Sinai theophany, characterized as it is by volcanic motifs[26] (Ex. 19; Jgs. 5:4f.; Dt. 33:2; Hab. 3; 1 Enoch 1:3-7), does not use the storm motif at all; this suggests a certain distancing from the mythology of the weather god. Finally, the theologically extremely interesting Elijah theophany (1 K. 19) with its *d^emāmâ* motif ("dead calm")[27] represents an isolated case, and differs so demonstrably from the usual theophany portrayals that one must assume the presence of radically monotheist polemic in the background.

In Ps. 50:3 (presumably an older psalm), Yahweh's coming is accompanied by fire and storms. The prophets pick up on God's appearance at judgment here and in part develop it further (Jer. 25:32), with subsequent redactors sometimes adding even more material from tradition (vv. 30f.). Ezekiel portrays his own call vision with theophanic colors (Ezk. 1:4). With the exile, however, the judgment theophany yields to the deliverance theophany (cf. Isa. 29:6;[28] Nah. 1:3; Zec. 9:14). Only the poet of Job continues to use the earlier diction in portraying Yahweh's onslaught in the terminology of judgment theophanies (Job 9:17; 38:1; 40:6).

The postexilic creation psalms use this collection of motifs to demonstrate God's power over creation. He causes the stormy wind to arise (Ps. 107:25), then commands it to be still again (v. 29; cf. Mt. 8:26); storms and winds are ultimately dispossessed of any remnants of numinous power when they become Yahweh's messengers (Ps. 148:8; 104:3f.).[29]

4. *Holy War.* Several of these motifs also occur in connection with portrayals of holy war.[30] The petitioner entreats God to engage the entirety of his cosmic power to rout his enemies: "As fire consumes the forest, as the flame sets the mountains ablaze, so pursue

---

23. Cf. R. P. Carroll, "The Elijah-Elisha Sagas," *VT* 19 (1969) 410f.
24. Pp. 73-117.
25. L. Köhler, *OT Theology* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1957), 26f.; → עָנָן *'ānān*.
26. → סִינַי *sînay*.
27. → דמה II, *d^eāmâ*, III, 264f.; Jeremias, 112-15; cf. C. Macholz, "Psalm 29 und 1 Kön 19," *Werden und Wirken des ATs. FS C. Westermann* (Göttingen, 1980), 329-33.
28. Though H. Wildberger, *Jesaja 28–39. BK* X/3 (1982), in loc., dates this to 701.
29. → מלאך *mal'āḵ* (VIII, 308-25).
30. Cf. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 119; Wildberger, *Jesaja 28–39,* 1109.

them with your tempest and terrify them with your hurricane" (Ps. 83:15f.[14f.]). Am. 1:14 mentions wind and storm in addition to the cry of war *(t^erû'â);* Isa. 28:2 describes the destruction of Samaria in the image of a theophany of war. Yahweh's wrath "has gone forth, a whirling tempest; it will burst upon the head of the wicked" (Jer. 23:19; 30:23; cf. Ps. 58:10[9]), pummeling them with hailstones (Ezk. 13:13; cf. v. 11 and Josh. 10:11) such that their walls crumble. His tempest carries off the powerful of the earth like stubble (Isa. 40:24). In an oracle of salvation, the same prophet assures the exiles that they, too, will have a portion of this divine power in overcoming the difficulties of returning home: "You shall winnow them [mountains and hills] and the wind shall carry them away, and the tempest shall scatter them" (Isa. 41:16).

Fabry

סַף *sap*

Contents: I. Etymology, Extrabiblical Occurrences. II. OT: Meanings and Synonyms. III. Symbolism and Special Meanings.

I. Etymology, Extrabiblical Occurrences. The masc. noun *sap* occurs in most of the Semitic languages. Akk. *sippu* is attested in widely varying texts; although it probably involves a Semitic root, a connection with Sum. *zib* cannot be excluded.[1] Other witnesses include Jewish Aram. *sippā',* Syr. *seppā',* Mand. *sîppā,* and perhaps Phoen. *sp.*[2] A Nabatean version of the root is also suspected.[3]

This term comes from the vocabulary of ancient Semitic architecture and refers to an object involving a house entry, a gate, or the framework of a door, though an exact identification is rather difficult. For example, several different interpretations have already been suggested for Akk. *sippu,* including "threshold" (so also for Heb. *sap*), and also "door frame, stone frame, door hinge," as well as "door hingestone, stone socle," etc.[4]

The scope of the different translations doubtless derives from the technical varia-

---

sap. W. Dever and S. Paul, eds., "Architectural Elements," *Biblical Archaeology* (Jerusalem/New York, 1973), 30-42; K. Galling and H. Rösel, "Tür," *BRL*², 348f.; A. van Gennep, "The Territorial Passage," *Rites of Passage* (Eng. trans., Chicago, 1960), 15-25; J. Ouelette, "The Shaking of the Thresholds in Amos 9:1," *HUCA* 43 (1972) 23-27; A. Salonen, *Die Türen des Alten Mesopotamien. AnAcScFen* B 124 (Helsinki, 1961), esp. 62-66; H. C. Trumbull, *The Threshold Covenant* (Edinburgh, 1896); H. Weidhaus, "Der *bīt ḫilāni,*" *ZA* 45 (1939) 123-25; O. Wintermute, "Threshold," *IDBSup,* 905.

1. *AHw,* II, 1049; Salonen, 63.
2. *LexSyr,* 489; *CSD,* 385; *MdD,* 329; M. Lidzbarski, *Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik* (Weimar, 1898), 230.
3. *HAL,* II, 763; *DNSI,* II, 796f.
4. Cf. R. S. Ellis, *Foundation Deposits in Ancient Mesopotamia* (New Haven, 1968); Weidhaus; and esp. Salonen.

tions in the actual frameworks for doors and gates, variations themselves dependent on the nature of the house and inhabitants in question. For example, many monumental buildings in Mesopotamia had door hinge sockets on both sides of the portals that were sunken into the threshold or sill stone. Accordingly, the sides of the door contained pivots *('ammôṯ).* The hollowed-out stones serving as hinge sockets were not identical with the continuous threshold and were accordingly installed to be concealed. Akk. *sippu* probably sometimes refers to such hinge sockets; cf. also *sap̱* in Ex. 12:22, where it is usually translated as "basin" (for the blood), even though it is used together with *m^e^zûzôṯ,* "doorposts," *mašqôp̱,* "lintel," and *peṯaḥ,* "door."[5]

II. OT: Meanings and Synonyms.

The noun *sap̱* occurs 24 times in the OT: 11 in the Prophets, 6 in the Deuteronomistic history, 5 in the Chronicler's history, and twice in Esther. The denominative verb *spp* occurs only in Ps. 84:11(Eng. v. 10) in the hithpolel with the meaning "stand at the threshold." The OT uses the word primarily in connection with the entry to the temple. In 3 instances the reference is to the palace portal (1 K. 14:17; Est. 2:21; 6:2; perhaps also Zeph. 2:14 in reference to the palace at Nineveh), and twice to the door of a private house (Jgs. 19:27; Ezk. 43:8). In most instances the meaning "threshold" is appropriate, esp. in Ezk. 43:8, where *sap̱* parallels *m^e^zuzôṯ,* "doorposts." Isa. 6:4 uses *sap̱* in connection with the difficult word *'ammôṯ,* which can also mean "doorposts." The tragic conclusion to Jgs. 19 shows a woman lying at the door of the house "with her hands on the threshold" (v. 27). The meaning "threshold" is illustrated by Palestinian house design. The threshold was made either of a single piece of stone or of individual stones mortared together; it was elevated slightly above the surrounding level of the entryway to prevent water from seeping in.

Although the LXX has difficulty with this word, using several different terms to translate it (most frequently *próthyron* and *stathmós*), the evidence from Qumran together with other architectural terms show that the reference is to the horizontal threshold as the "foundational" element of the entryway. According to 11QT 49:13, any defilement of a house necessitates a purification or cleansing of the portal, including the door locks *(mn'wlym),* doorposts *(mzwzwt),* thresholds *('spym),* and lintels *(mšqwpym;* all this involves a differentiated explication of Nu. 19:14ff.); for this terminology, see also 11QT 36:9 and 5Q15 1 i 15ff. and the description of the new Jerusalem. Thresholds are also mentioned in 3Q15 2:12; 12:2. The only meaning deviating from these might be found in the unclear passage Ezk. 40:6f., which may refer to the door space in general.

III. Symbolism and Special Meanings.

The threshold plays an important role in the general phenomenology of the border area between different human activities, the most important being that between the pri-

---

5. Cf. *HAL,* II, 763, s.v. *sp* I; A. M. Honeyman, "Hebrew סף 'Basin, Goblet,'" *JTS* 37 (1936) 56-59.

vate and the public, the "threshold" representing the neutral zone between the two. Many cultures associate a great number of magic-religious rites with crossing a threshold, and the ground beneath the threshold is often the locus of certain offerings and even threshold-related magic.[6] Inscribed hooks found in Ugarit may represent such apotropaic threshold offerings.[7] Light was also thought to have apotropaic qualities, which is why lamps were often deposited beneath thresholds.[8]

Special meaning attaches to such rites when they involve crossing a threshold between the secular and sacred spheres. Accordingly, *sap̱* in the OT corresponds primarily to precisely this "threshold." The custom of jumping over the temple threshold seems to have been practiced at the temple of Dagon in Ashdod (the apparent reference in 1 S. 5:4f., though here the reference is not to *sap̱* but to the synonym *mip̱tān*).[9]

The religious significance of this separation between the secular and sacred spheres within the temple complex was amplified by the fact that many economically and nationally significant events took place within the threshold because of the requisite protection they enjoyed there. Similarly, the inhabitants of a locale also sought protection from external danger by retreating to the interior of a house. The portal of a house thus acquired critical significance in regulating the movement of people and goods across the threshold.

For this reason, the three "guardians of the threshold" (*šōmᵉrê hassap̱,* Jer. 35:4; 52:24; 2 K. 12:10[9]; 22:4; 23:4; 25:18; 1 Ch. 9:19; 2 Ch. 34:9) represent important officials within the temple hierarchy. Jer. 52:24 = 2 K. 25:18 shows their precise rank to be beneath the high priest and the second priest. Their service at the temple threshold in both fiscal and religious matters emerges from their role in connection with Josiah's (2 K. 22:4; 2 Ch. 34:9) and Jehoash's (2 K. 12:10[9]) cult reforms, and also from Josiah's temple cleansing (2 K. 23:4). That there were three such guardians derives from the temple's three main gate precincts (Ezk. 40:6,24,35), each of which had a "threshold guardian" overseeing the traffic through that particular gate.[10] These high officials should not be confused with the lower-ranking office of the Levitical *šōʿᵃrê-hassap̱,* who during the postexilic period performed their service in groups of hundreds and who held office as "gatekeepers" in the literal sense (1 Ch. 9:22; 2 Ch. 23:4; cf. also 1 Ch. 9:19, where *šʿr* is replaced by *šmr*).

Meyers

6. Cf. B. Rehfeldt, "Schwelle," *RGG*³, V, 1620.

7. Cf. H. Weippert, "Hacke," *BRL*², 132; also M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, "Die fünf beschrifteten Äxte aus Ugarit," *UF* 6 (1974) 463.

8. R. H. Smith, "The Household Lamps of Palestine in OT Times," *BA* 27 (1964) 2-31, 101-24, esp. 13.

9. Cf. the interpretation in H. Donner, "'Die Schwellenhüpfer.' Beobachtungen zu Zephanja 1,8f.," *JSS* 15 (1970) 42-55.

10. Cf. W. McKane, "A Note on 2 Kings 12:10 (Evv 12:9)," *ZAW* 71 (1959) 260-65, who offers a different job description for the threshold guardians.

סָפַד *sāpad̠;* מִסְפֵּד *mispēd̠*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology, Cognates; 2. Meaning; 3. Valence. II. Primary Use: Lament. III. Figurative Use. IV. General Use: Lament in Situations of Distress. V. Summary. VI. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology, Cognates.* The root *spd* is attested in Akkadian (*sapādu,* "lament, mourn"; *sipdu, sipittum,* "mourning"),[1] Ugaritic (*mšspdt,* "wailing women"),[2] Aramaic (*s^epad̠,* "strike one's breast, sound a lament"; *sip̄dā',* "lament for the dead"; *sāp^ed̠ā',* "lament singer"), Syriac (*s^epad̠,* "strike one's breast, lament"), and probably also Ethiopic (*sadafē,* "lament"). Both Isa. 32:12 and the LXX rendering with *kóptesthai* or *kopetós* seem to suggest that the basic meaning is "beat (one's breast)." It everywhere refers first of all to ritual lament for the dead, and then also to gestures and cries associated with laments in other situations of distress. In Hebrew the basic stem is joined only by the N stem (Jer. 16:4; 25:13) and the derivative noun *mispēd̠.*

2. *Meaning.* The frequent occurrence of the verb and noun in connection with news of a person's death (Gen. 23:2; 50:10; 1 S. 25:1; 28:3; 2 S. 1:12; 3:31; 11:26, etc.) and the close association *sāpad̠–qāb̠ar* (1 K. 13:29; 14:13; Jer. 16:4; 25:33) show that the verb and noun refer to a custom or rite attaching primarily to lament for the dead. The behavior so designated is accompanied by other signs of mourning: → בכה *bāk̠â (bākhāh),*[3] weeping (2 S. 1:12; Isa. 22:12; Ezk. 24:16,23), fasting (2 S. 1:12; Joel 2:12;

---

sāpad̠. F. Ahuis, *Der klagende Gerichtsprophet. Studien zur Klage in der Überlieferung von den alttestamentlichen Gerichtspropheten. CThM* A/12 (1982); M. Ayali, "Gottes und Israels Trauer über die Zerstörung des Tempels," *Kairos* 23 (1981) 215-31; E. Feldmann, "Law and Theology in Biblical and Postbiblical Defilement and Mourning Rites" (diss., Emory, 1971); E. Gerstenberger, "Der klagende Mensch: Anmerkungen zu den Klagegattungen in Israel," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 64-72; C. Hardmeier, *Texttheorie und biblische Exegese: Zur rhetorischen Funktion der Trauermetaphorik in der Prophetie. BEvT* 79 (1978); E. Kutsch, *"Trauerbräuche" und "Selbstminderungsriten" im AT. ThS* 78 (1965); N. Lohfink, "Enthielten die im AT bezeugten Klageriten eine Phase des Schweigens?" *VT* 12 (1962) 260-77; M. S. Moore, "Human Suffering in Lamentations," *RB* 90 (1983) 534-55; J. Morgenstern, *Rites of Birth, Marriage, Death and Kindred Occasions among Semites* (Chicago, 1966); H.-P. Müller, "Gilgameschs Trauergesang um Enkidu und die Gattung der Totenklage," *ZA* 68 (1978) 233-50, esp. 234f.; G. S. Ogden, "Joel 4 and Prophetic Responses to National Laments," *JSOT* 26 (1983) 97-106; H. R. Rabinowitz, "Terms for Eulogies in the Bible," *BethM* 17 (1971/72) 235f., 255; G. Rinaldi, "מִסְפֵּד," *Bibl* 40 (1959) 278; J. Scharbert, *Der Schmerz im AT. BBB* 8 (1955), 60-62; G. Stählin, "κοπετός, κόπτω," *TDNT,* III, 830-60; E. F. de Ward, "Mourning Customs in 1, 2 Samuel," *JJS* 23 (1972) 1-27, 145-66; C. Westermann, "The Structure and History of the Lament in the OT," *Praise and Lament in the Psalms* (Eng. trans., Atlanta, 1981), 165-213; → אבל *'āb̠al ('ābhal)* (I, 44-48).

1. *AHw,* II, 1024, 1048.
2. *WUS,* no. 1944.
3. *TDOT,* II, 116-20.

Zec. 7:5), putting on sackcloth, rending of clothes (2 S. 3:31; Est. 4:1), crying out or "wailing" (Jer. 4:8; 49:3; Mic. 1:8), and raising a lamentation (*qînâ,* Ezk. 27:32). The most frequent parallels to both the verb and noun are *'āḇal* and *'ēḇel* (Gen. 50:10; 2 S. 11:26; Jer. 6:26; Mic. 1:8; Est. 4:3; Sir. 34:17). Gen. 50:10 shows that *'āḇal* and *sāpaḏ* are not simply synonyms; here *mispēḏ* is the ritual lamentation lasting apparently only a single day and described as "very great and sorrowful," while *'āḇal* refers to the attitude or disposition of mourning lasting seven days. In addition, both the verb (Eccl. 3:4) and the noun (Ps. 30:12[Eng. v. 11]) are contrasted with expressions of joy, especially with "dance" *(rāqaḏ, māḥôl).*

3. *Valence.* The verb is often used absolutely in the sense of "to conduct a mourning ritual" (2 S. 1:12; 1 K. 13:29; Eccl. 3:4; Jer. 4:8; 49:3; Ezk. 24:16; Joel 1:13; Mic. 1:8; Zec. 7:5; 12:12). Whether the corpse or thing about which one is lamenting is present or not, reference is made to it with *lᵉ* (Gen. 23:2; 50:10; 1 S. 25:1; 28:3; 1 K. 14:13,18) or *'al* (2 S. 11:26; 1 K. 13:29f.; Isa. 32:12; Zec. 12:10). If one is emphasizing expressly that the corpse is actually present at the lamentation, the verb is construed with *lip̱nê* (2 S. 3:31: "before Abner" [NRSV "over Abner"]). The *figura etymologica sāpaḏ mispēḏ* occurs only in Gen. 50:10; "to make lamentation" is otherwise expressed as *'āśâ mispēḏ* (Jer. 6:26; Mic. 1:8). Isa. 32:12 construes the verb with double *'al* in the expression *sāpaḏ 'al-šāḏayim 'al . . . ,* "wail in lamentation (by beating) on your breasts for. . . ." Passages such as 1 K. 13:29f.; Jer. 22:18; 34:5; and Am. 5:16 show that both the verb and the noun can evoke the notion not only of certain gestures but of vocal articulations as well. A *mispēḏ* includes, among other things, the cries "alas, alas!" *(hôy, hôy),* "alas, my brother, alas, sister!"; "alas, lord, alas, his majesty!"

The subject of the niphal stem of the verb is the person whose death is being lamented; thus "someone is the object of the lament, a lament is held for someone."

II. Primary Use: Lament. Both the verb and the noun most frequently refer to the ritual lament for the deceased conducted soon after the person's death or after hearing the news of that death. As a rule, the lament takes place in the presence of the corpse and immediately before interment (Gen. 23:2; 1 S. 25:1; 2 S. 3:31; 1 K. 13:29f.). Reference to "all Israel" having mourned some great person (Samuel in 1 S. 28:3; the royal prince in 1 K. 14:13,18; the Maccabean heroes in 1 Mc. 2:70; 9:20; 13:26) probably means that public mourning ceremonies were conducted first at the place of actual death and interment and in the presence of the corpse, and then throughout the entire country upon arrival of the news of death. Similarly, David and his men (2 S. 1:12) and the wife of Uriah (11:26) mourn the fallen Saul and his sons or the fallen spouse as soon as the news reaches them from the front. A longer period passes in Gen. 50:10 between the actual moment of death and the public celebration of mourning. Jacob died in Egypt and was embalmed, a procedure lasting 40 days according to v. 3, and was then brought to the land of Canaan in a solemn procession. While the body was still in Egypt, before it was transported back to the land of the patriarchs, the Egyptians themselves held "a very great and sorrowful lamentation," one specifically distinguished from the "weeping" for Jacob in Egypt, which according to v. 3 lasted 70 days. Al-

though not expressly stated, the story probably presupposes that immediately after the death of their father in Egypt, Jacob's sons held the customary mourning ritual in private. Jer. 34:5 suggests that at least in the later monarchy, when a king died the mourning ceremony was conducted in close connection with the cremation of the corpse.

Jeremiah warns King Jehoiakim (22:18) and the inhabitants of Jerusalem (16:4,6; 25:33) that they will not be buried, nor will any lamentation ceremony be conducted for them; in the chaos of war, their corpses will remain uninterred. As a sign of this, the prophet himself is not permitted to enter a house of lament or to take part in any lamentation (16:5).[4] Indeed, when Ezekiel's wife suddenly dies, he is allowed neither to participate in her funeral nor to "weep" for her, again as a sign that the chaos of war will prevent his fellow citizens from mourning their fallen sons (24:16,23). Eccl. 12:5 suggests that the mourning rites designated by *sāpad* were also conducted during the procession to the grave site ("and the mourners will go about the streets"). Ben Sirach does not think much of exaggerated, overly long mourning, advising instead to conclude the *mispēd* and *'ēbel* within two days and then to be comforted in one's grief (38:17).

Zec. 12:10-14 mentions mourning rites held only after an initial disregard for the person's death and after an initial denial of the usual rites. Only after Yahweh has poured out his "spirit of compassion and supplication on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem" will they mourn "the one whom they have pierced . . . as one mourns for an only child;[5] on that day, the mourning in Jerusalem will be as great as the mourning for Hadad-rimmon in the plain of Megiddo." This tells us that the death of an only son prompted an especially impressive lament, and that a mourning ceremony was customarily held for Hadad-rimmon, probably annually, in the vicinity of Megiddo. Most exegetes assume that this is referring to a mourning rite involving a vegetation deity; the former northern kingdom may well have had pagan inhabitants who conducted such ritual lamentations within the framework of their fertility cult. As discussed above, mourning rites designated by *sāpad* or *mispēd* characteristically included the beating of one's breasts and the articulation of short cries with the interjections *hô hô* (Am. 5:16) and *hôy*, "alas!" along with a designation of kinship or the title "lord" (*'ādôn*), thus "alas, my brother!" (1 K. 13:30); "alas, lord!" (Jer. 34:5). Jer. 22:18 shows that such cries had even become clichés; at the death of a king one cried out, "'Alas, my brother!' or 'Alas, sister!'. . . 'Alas, lord!' or 'Alas, his majesty!' (*hōdōh*)." Although these cries were not strictly speaking part of the dirge (*qînâ*), they probably did accompany it (cf. 2 S. 1:19-27; 3:33f.). The frequently attested association of *sāpad* and *mispēd* with other expressions of pain shows that participants in such mourning rituals rent their clothing, sprinkled dust on their heads, wept and otherwise "wailed" in an inarticulate fashion, and sometimes even fasted. These signs of grief, however, obviously lasted beyond the actual mourning rite itself on the day of interment or arrival of the news of death, and belonged to the actual "mourning" period extending over several days (cf. discussion above). One must thus distinguish between the actual mourning ritual (*mispēd*) associated with the sounding of the dirge on the one hand, and on the other hand the

---

4. → מרזח *marzēaḥ* (IX, 10-15).
5. → יחד *yāḥad* (VI, 40-48).

"mourning" *('ēbel)* extending over a longer period of time, with several expressions of grief overlapping between the two.

III. Figurative Use. Ezk. 27:31f. uses the noun with a double figurative meaning. Ezekiel describes the city of Tyre as a sunken ship over which merchants mourn as if over a dead person. They make themselves bald, put on sackcloth, weep, "mourn bitterly" *(mispēd mar),* and raise a lamentation *(w^{e}qôn^{e}nû qînâ).* Although certain Akkadian texts also mention the lament for a city, nowhere to my knowledge do they mention one for a ship.

Figurative use is also found in the comparison between the prophet's lament for his people and the *mispēd* of the jackal and the *'ēbel* of the ostriches. The only possible point of comparison here is the howling cries these animals make, sounds recalling those of lament (Mic. 1:8).

IV. General Use: Lament in Situations of Distress. People who lament a great misfortune or great distress behave similarly to those who lament the dead. Both the verb and the noun accordingly appear frequently in such situations, though it is sometimes difficult to determine whether the issue does not involve a lament for the dead in the literal sense. The "great mourning with fasting and weeping and *mispēd* in sackcloth and ashes" (Est. 4:1-3) in which Mordecai and the Jews engage throughout the Persian kingdom might refer not only to the general mourning accompanying the enormous danger in which they found themselves as a result of the king's decree, but also to anticipated mourning for the dead, i.e., for themselves, since no one would be left to mourn the murdered Jews. In prophetic oracles of judgment as well, oracles in which the prophets warn their own or foreign people about being massacred in war, the verb or noun together with other expressions of lament can refer to the lament over the terrible distress in general brought on by war, as well as to an actual lament for the dead, for the fallen warriors and those murdered by hostile soldiers (Jer. 4:8; 6:26; 48:38; 49:3; Am. 5:16f.; Mic. 1:8,11). The decimation of fields and vineyards is probably the reason Isa. 32:12 tells his readers to "beat your breasts in lamentation." Joel 1:13 orders the priests to put on sackcloth, to "wail," and to lament *(sāpad)* because locusts have decimated the vineyards and fields. This apparently refers to a cultic liturgy of lament, one prompted by a natural catastrophe, in which the priests function as liturgical personnel.

According to Zec. 7:5, a liturgical lament associated with fasting at certain times over the course of the year, in the fifth and seventh months, took place for "seventy years" in Jerusalem to commemorate the destruction of the temple in 586 B.C.

Under certain circumstances, the noun can also refer to penitential rites. Thus according to Isa. 22:12f. Yahweh orders the inhabitants of Jerusalem "to weeping and *mispēd,* to baldness and putting on sackcloth," only to discover that "instead there was joy and festivity, killing oxen and slaughtering sheep, eating meat and drinking wine." According to Joel 2:12f., Yahweh sees the disaster that has smitten the people with a plague of locusts, viewed here apparently as punishment for sins, and orders the people to "return to me with all your heart, with fasting, with weeping, and with *mispēd,*" and to rend not their clothing but their hearts.

V. Summary. In the OT the verb and noun constructed from the stem *spd* refer to a complex of expressions of great suffering consisting largely in the gesture of beating one's breast and in more or less traditionally standardized or spontaneous cries or sounds of lament. The corresponding behavior cannot always be distinguished clearly from *'āḇal.* The primary locus of the expressions of suffering designated by the verb and noun is lament for the dead; although the dirge *(qînâ)* is part of this, it is not identical with it but rather is part of the *mispēḏ,* i.e., of the "mourning ritual." The expressions of suffering designated by the stem *spd* carry strong ritual overtones, something shown by the fact that both the noun and the verb also refer to liturgical celebrations commemorating painful events (e.g., the destruction of the temple) and to celebrations conducted by priests to announce penitence and religious conversion. In this respect *mispēḏ* can allude to assembling for public mourning, something suggested especially by Am. 5:16. In poetic diction one can speak about the "lamentation" for a destroyed city or for a sunken ship, just as one can raise a "dirge" in the same situations. Zec. 12:10-14 confirms that *spd* refers to ritually strictly organized lamentation celebrations, since here the participants mourn the "one whom they have pierced," lamenting in groups organized according to clans, the clans even being further subdivided according to men and women. Although such ritual organization may not have been followed this strictly in every case, and may not always have been observed, especially in the case of lamentation over the calamities of war or other catastrophes, it does not seem to have lacked formality altogether.

VI. Qumran. The Qumran documents attest but a single occurrence of *mispēḏ* (*sāpaḏ* does not occur): 1QH 11:22, which uses the term among the repertoire of its synonyms. The petitioner adduces virtually the entire word field involving lament and mourning. His anthropological insights prompt bitter grief *('ēḇel yāgôn)* and grief-stricken mourning *('ēḇel m^e^rôrîm).* His meditations are full of sorrowful groans *('^a^nāḥâ),* and he breaks out in bitter lamentation *(mispēḏ m^e^rôrîm).*

Scharbert

סָפָה *sāpâ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT. III. LXX and Qumran.

I. Etymology. The root *spy* occurs not only in Hebrew but also in Jewish Aramaic ("collect, destroy, perish"), Syriac ("collect"), and Arabic ("stir up dust and carry it away" [wind as subj.]), while Old South Arabic "destroy" is doubtful (perhaps a Minaean causative of *f'y*).[1] Aramaic and Syriac "collect" is the semantic equivalent of

1. ContiRossini, 198b.

Heb. *'āsap,* which can also mean "take away, exterminate." The form *sāpû* in Am. 3:15 (par. *'ābᵉdû*) might also derive from *sûp,* "come to an end," while the intransitive *sāpᵉtâ,* "vanish," in Jer. 12:4 can only derive from *sāpâ.* One should probably read *sepet* (from *yāsap,* "add to, increase") in Nu. 32:14 and Isa. 30:1 instead of *sᵉpôt;* similarly, the hiphil form *'aspeh* in Dt. 32:23 should probably be read as *'ōsipâ* and derived from *yāsap* (or is this a form of *'āsap?* cf. LXX *synáxō*). This might involve various expansions of a base *sp,* though in that case the semantic development remains obscure. It more likely involves orthographic variants.

This yields 6 certain occurrences of the qal (+ Am. 3:15) and 9 for the niphal (+ twice in Sirach).

II. OT. This word refers first of all to snatching away in a completely concrete fashion. David spares Saul with the words, "As Yahweh lives, Yahweh will strike him down; or his day will come to die; or he will go down into battle and perish ['be snatched away']" (1 S. 26:10). The expression *yômô yābô' wāmēt* refers to natural death, *bammilḥāmâ yērēd wᵉnispâ* to violent death in war. Yahweh's judgment will find him in any case. Elsewhere, David fears that he will "be snatched away one day by the hand of Saul" (i.e., be killed; NRSV "perish"; 1 S. 27:1). Isa. 13:15 describes the routing of the Babylonian army; they will flee, and "whoever is found *(māṣā')* will be thrust through, and whoever is caught [snatched away, picked out of the host of those who flee; *sāpâ* niphal] will fall by the sword." Ps. 40:15(Eng. v. 14) mentions adversaries who "seek to snatch away my life." Finally, 1 Ch. 21:12 is to be read with the par. 2 S. 24:13 as *nusᵉkā(h)* ("you must flee") instead of *nispeh.*

Among the theologically more interesting occurrences, 4 refer to the destruction of Sodom. In his intercession Abraham asks God: "Will you indeed sweep away the righteous with the wicked?" (Gen. 18:23). The alternative "forgive" (*nāśā',* v. 24) shows that being swept away or destroyed is meant as punishment for sin. On the morning of the day of destruction, God prompts Lot to flee with his family into the mountains to avoid being swept away (niphal, Gen. 19:15,17). Nu. 16:26 also deals expressly with punishment for sins. During the revolt of Korah, Moses orders the community to stay away from Korah and his adherents, "or you will be swept away for all their sins." In his own farewell discourse (1 S. 12), Samuel advises that "if you still do wickedly, you shall be swept away, both you and your king" (v. 25).

Although the text of Prov. 13:23 is obscure, one possible rendering may be: "the newly tilled (?) field of the poor may yield much food, but possession *(yēš)* is swept away through injustice *(bᵉlō' mišpāṭ).*" The only thing clear in this passage is that a causal nexus obtains between justice and being swept away. The announcement of punishment in Isa. 7:18-20 warns that Yahweh "will shave with a razor hired beyond the River — with the king of Assyria — the head and the hair of the feet [of Israel], and it will take off (*sāpâ* qal) the beard as well." One concrete image evokes the utter devastation of the land. Jer. 12:4 uses *sāpâ* intransitively: "For the wickedness of those who live in it [i.e., the land] the animals and the birds are swept away *(sāpᵉtâ).*" As already mentioned, Am. 3:15 may also belong in this context; the beautiful houses of Sa-

maria will perish *('ā̱bᵉḏû)* and disappear *(sāpû),* or, deriving *sāpû* from *sûp,* "shall come to an end" (cf. *sāpû tammû,* Ps. 73:19).

Dt. 29:18(19) is not clear. The idolater speaks a blessing for himself and says: "I shall have *šālôm* though I walk in the stubbornness of my heart *lᵉma'an sᵉpôṯ hārāwâ 'eṯ-haṣṣᵉmē'â.*" First, it is unclear whether *lᵉma'an* is referring to his own intentions or to the concrete result. Second, *sᵉpôṯ* can be either transitive ("sweep away") or intransitive ("disappear"). Third, *'eṯ* can be either *nota accusativi* or the prep. "with" (EÜ chooses the first alternative: "so that water in plenty ends the drought," which would thus be his careless intention). Bertholet's suggestion is worth noting according to which saying that "the moist as well as the dry (land) [= everything without exception] is swept away," for example, as if by a raging stream, actually represents a proverb of sorts.[2] That is, the idolater's hubris causes both the just and the unjust to be swept away simultaneously.[3]

Sir. 5:7 says that Yahweh's wrath will suddenly break loose, "and at the time of punishment you will be swept away." Sir. 8:15 warns against trafficking with the reckless, "for through their folly you will be swept away," i.e., such people will draw you into misfortune along with themselves.

III. LXX and Qumran. The LXX's preferred translation is *(syn)apollýnai* (6 times), then *prostithénai,* "hand over, deliver" (3 times in 1 Samuel), and finally also *aphaireín, exaireín, aphanízesthai, symparalambánein,* and *synágein.*

Both occurrences in the writings of Qumran involve Dt. 29:18(19). 1QpHab 11:14 says that the wicked priest "walked in the ways of drunkenness *lᵉma'an sᵉpôṯ haṣṣᵉmē'â,* which here must mean "that he might quench his thirst." 1QS 2:14 quotes the passage from Deuteronomy with several alterations and refers it to him who wants to enjoy the advantages of the covenant but without penance. He says, "Peace be with me, even though I walk in the stubbornness of my heart," to which the author responds: "His spirit shall be swept away, the thirsty [spirit?] with the sated, without pardon."

Ringgren

---

2. A. Bertholet, *Deuteronomium. KHC* V (1899), 90.

3. A different view is taken by J. Blau, "Über homonyme und angeblich homonyme Wurzeln II," *VT* 7 (1957) 98-102, here 99f., who identifies the root here as *šph* (cf. Arab. *šafā,* "heal"), meaning "quench one's thirst."

סָפַק sāp̱aq; סֶפֶק sep̱eq; שָׂפַק śāp̱aq

Contents: I. Etymology. II. *sāp̱aq*, "Strike, Clap One's Hands." III. *śāp̱aq*, "Suffice, Abound." IV. LXX.

I. Etymology. Heb. *sāp̱aq* (spelled *śāp̱aq* in Job 27:23, in several mss. also in 34:37), "clap, strike," is apparently related to Arab. *safaqa*, "to strike in a clapping fashion," "to shake hands." It also occurs in Jewish Aramaic. Yet another word, *śāp̱aq*, "suffice, abound," is attested in several Aramaic dialects (and as an Aramaic loanword also in Akkadian) and is related to OSA *šfq*, "suffice, be abundant."[1] Arab. *šafiqa*, "have pity" (second and fourth form "decrease"), probably does not belong in this context.

II. *sāp̱aq*, "Strike, Clap One's Hands." Both Job 27:23 and Lam. 2:15 use "clap one's hands *(kappayim)* parallel with *šāraq*, "hiss, whistle," as an expression of malicious pleasure or of derision. In a lengthy exposition (Job 27:13-23), Zophar describes the ultimate fate of the wicked, concluding with the words: "One claps one's hands at him, and hisses [mocks] at him when he departs [? *mimmᵉqômô*]." According to Lam. 2:15, "all who pass along the way clap their hands" at Jerusalem; "they hiss and wag *(nûaʿ)* their heads at daughter Jerusalem." The meaning of this gesture emerges from the words they then speak: "Is this the city that was called the perfection of beauty?" This is probably less a matter of pain and horror than of malicious pleasure and triumph. The gesture may also originally have had apotropaic meaning.

Zeph. 2:15 offers a different combination with reference to the enemy's "exultant city," using *šāraq* and *hēnîaʿ yāḏ*, "shake one's fist," a gesture at once both defensive and mocking. The verb is also used together with *kappayim* in Nu. 24:10. After Balaam has already blessed Israel three times, "Balak's anger was kindled against Balaam, and he struck his hands together," a gesture expressing the emotion of indignation.[2]

The meaning of Job 34:37 is disputed. Elihu maintains that Job deserves to be punished, "for he adds transgression *(pešaʿ)* to his sin *ḥaṭṭāʾṯ*); he strikes among us *(bênênu yispôq)*, and multiplies his words against God." Either one adds *kappayim* here to mean he claps his hands together as an expression of his mocking attitude toward God (NRSV "he claps his hands among us"), something fully compatible with the increase of rebellious words, or one associates *spq* with Aram. *spq* pael, "occasion doubt, raise doubts," and takes *pešaʿ* as the object: "he casts doubt on his sins."

Twice the object of *sāp̱aq* is *yārēḵ*, "thigh." According to Jer. 31:19, Ephraim (the northern kingdom) will turn back to Yahweh and say: "For after I turned back *(šûḇ)* I repented *(nḥm)*; and after I came to understand (*ydʿ* niphal) I struck my thigh; I was

1. *AHw*, II, 1026; Biella, 522.
2. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), in loc.

ashamed *(bôš),* and I was dismayed (*klm* niphal)." The context suggests that this gesture expresses the feeling of shame; it may represent a traditional gesture of remorse or lamentation. According to Ezk. 21:17(Eng. v. 12), upon receiving news of Yahweh's sword, the prophet is to strike his thigh. The verse also contains the command to "cry and wail" *(zeʿaq wehêlēl),* suggesting that this refers again to a gesture of lamentation or to an expression of horror. It is also worth noting that vv. 19 and 22(14,17) also refer to striking one's hands together *(hikkâ kap̱ 'el-kap̱).*

Job 34:26 involves striking in the sense of punishment. Elihu says: "He strikes them like the wicked while others look on." The following verse supplies the reason: "because they turned aside from following him, and had no regard for any of his ways."

III. *śāp̱aq,* "Suffice, Abound." The hiphil form in Isa. 2:6 is disputed. The prophet reprimands "the house of Jacob" for being "full of diviners [read *miqsām*] from the east, and of soothsayers like the Philistines," and "*yaspîqû* children of foreigners." The usual understanding is that this is related to Arab. *safaqa,* "to shake hands,"[3] i.e., to making alliances with foreigners. More likely, however, it refers to *śpq,* "be abundant," which also fits the par. *mālē',* "be full," i.e., the country is overcrowded with foreigners.[4] The same *śpq* then also occurs in 1 K. 20:10. King Ben-hadad of Aram swears that "the dust of Samaria will not 'suffice' to provide a handful for each of the people who follow me."

This verb also occurs in several passages from Sirach. "For great is the wisdom of Yahweh; he is mighty in power and sees everything" (Sir. 15:18). In 31:12 *spwq* refers to the "abundance" of the table; in 31:30 wine adds many wounds *(mspq pṣʿ).*

The noun *sep̱eq* occurs twice in Job. Despite their superfluous fullness *(melō'ṯ sip̱qô),* the rich will still fall into distress (20:22). Job 36:18 is obscure. The MT reads: "Beware that wrath [textual error?] does not entice you in *sep̱eq.*" Does *besep̱eq* mean "at the [God's] blow," "in abundance," or "at the clapping of hands in mockery" (NRSV "into scoffing")? In any event, the second half of the verse mentions abundant bribery.

IV. LXX. The LXX translates this twice with *krotein (tás cheiras)* (Job 37:23; Lam. 2:15; so also Ezk. 21:17, which presupposes *yāḏeḵā* instead of *yārēḵ*), then also *synkrotein taís chersín* in Nu. 24:10. For the rest, the LXX either circumscribes the term or has a different reading.

Ringgren

3. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 97ff.

4. J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the OT* (1968; repr. Winona Lake, Ind., 1987), 232f.

סָפַר *sāpar;* מִסְפָּר *mispār*

Contents: I. 1. Basic Meaning, Occurrences; 2. LXX. II. The verb *spr:* 1. Qal and Niphal; 2. Piel and Pual. III. The Noun *mispār.* IV. Qumran.

I. 1. *Basic Meaning, Occurrences.* The basic meaning of the verb *spr* is "count." It occurs 27 times in the qal (including twice the ptcp. *sōpēr* [see discussion below]; additionally, *mî sāpar* is to be read in Nu. 23:10 instead of *mispār*),[1] 8 times in the niphal (as passive to the qal), 67 times in the piel (with the resultative meaning "enumerate, tell," 30 of which occur in the Psalms, though the text of 69:27[Eng. v. 26] has been corrupted, as probably also in 64:6[5]),[2] and 5 times in the pual (as passive to the piel). The noun *mispār,* "number," derives from this verb, and occurs 133 times (though doubtful in 1 Ch. 11:11[3] and incorrectly in 1 Ch. 27:24bβ [instead of *sēper*][4] and Nu. 23:10 [see above]; it also occurs once with the meaning "story" in Jgs. 7:15 corresponding to the verb's use in the piel) as does the hapax legomenon *s^e^pār,* "census" (2 Ch. 2:16, with aramaizing vocalization).[5] The word *s^e^pōrôṯ* in Ps. 71:15 is unclear ("number"? denominated from *sōpēr,* or a corrupted text?).[6] This word group is also attested in the Hebrew portions of Sirach (the verb 7 times, *mispār* 8 times).

Apart from Hebrew, the word group is attested in Ugaritic and Phoenician-Punic *(mspr),* in an altered form also in Ethiopic (*safara,* "to measure") and Old South Arabic (*sfrt,* "standard, measure").[7] It is not found in most of the Aramaic languages (including Biblical Aramaic), and occurs only in some of the more recent (*spr* in Samaritan [peal and pael] and Syriac [peal] in the meaning "tell").[8] The equivalent from

---

sāpar. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography V," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 428f.; E. Jenni, *HP;* J. Kühlewein, "סֵפֶר *sēper* book," *TLOT,* II, 806-13; S. Ö Steingrimsson, "Att räkna upp Herrens under," *SEÅ* 44 (1979) 68-73; S. Wagner, "ידע in den Lobliedern von Qumran," *Bibel und Qumran. FS Hans Bardtke* (Berlin, 1968), 232-52.

1. See *BHS.*

2. See *BHS* in both cases; concerning Ps. 64:6(5) also H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1989), 23.

3. See *BHS;* also W. Rudolph, *Chronikbücher. HAT* I/21 (1955), 96.

4. See *BHS.*

5. See M. Wagner, *Die lexikalischen und grammatikalischen Aramaismen im alttestamentlichen Hebräisch. BZAW* 96 (1966), 88f.

6. See L. Delekat, "Zum hebräischen Wörterbuch," *VT* 14 (1964) 32f.; W. Beyerlin, "Die *tôdā* der Heilsvergegenwärtigung," *ZAW* 79 (1967) 218; *HAL,* II, 768.

7. Concerning Middle Hebrew see *WTM,* III, 573f. (for the verb), 174, 578 (derivatives); concerning the Qumran texts see IV below. For Ugaritic see *UT,* no. 1793; *WUS,* no. 1947 (though in the colophons not, as assumed here, the perfect of a basic stem "write," but rather the noun *spr,* "scribe"; see *UT,* no. 1793). For Phoenician-Punic, *DNSI,* II, 666. For Ethiopic, Dillmann, *LexLingAeth,* 404; *WbTigr,* 201a. For Old South Arabic, Biella, 342.

8. J. L. Palache, *Semantic Notes on the Hebrew Lexicon* (Leiden, 1959), 52; *LexSyr,* 492.

genuine Aramaic is the word group *mny*, which is also attested in the Hebrew of the OT, resulting in overlapping in the qal and niphal.[9]

It is disputed whether an etymological relationship obtains between this word group and the noun → ספר *sēper* and the participial form → ספר *sōpēr*. In any event, the former is to be distinguished semantically from the latter. Only *sōpēr* in Isa. 33:18 (bis) is to be derived as a participle directly from *spr* in the qal. One might note, however, that in Ps. 56:9(8) and 87:6 the meaning "enumerate, write out" for *spr* in the qal, one attested also in Middle Hebrew and in late Aramaic, is probable or at least possible.[10] Most likely, however, this involves a secondary semantic development influenced by *sēper* or *sōpēr*, or a secondary derivation from these. The assertion that this word group actually has a different semantic content or a different derivation within the individual occurrences is not justified.[11]

2. *LXX*. With few exceptions, the LXX renders the qal and niphal of *spr* with *arithmeín* or *exarithmeín*, the piel and pual largely with *diēgeísthai*, less often with *exēgeísthai*, *ekdiēgeísthai*, as well as with various composites of *angéllein*, in isolated cases also with other verbs. In Ps. 48:13(12) and 87:6, the qal is rendered with *diēgeísthai*, in 56:9(8) with *exangéllein;* while in Job 38:37 and Ps. 22:18(17), by contrast, the piel is rendered with *arithmeín* and *exarithmeín* (with *grammatikoí* for *sōpēr* in Isa. 33:18bα). The equivalent for the noun *mispār* is *arithmós*, and only in isolated instances do other nouns or verbal forms appear (e.g., *anaríthmētos* for *'ên mispār; diḗgēsis* [*exḗgēsis*] in Jgs. 7:15).

II. The Verb *spr*.

1. *Qal and Niphal*. In the qal and niphal, *spr* refers to the counting off of equal quantities or entities for a specific purpose. For example, days, weeks, or years are counted off to delimit a specific period of time or to specify a point in time (Lev. 15:13,28; 23:15f.; 25:8; Dt. 16:9; Ezk. 44:26). Temple furnishings and vessels are counted out before being returned to Sheshbazzar (Ezr. 1:8), i.e., their inventory is checked and determined (cf. vv. 9-11a; cf. also the checking of an inventory according to Sir. 42:7 [Ms. B]). This is at once also the official act through which these vessels are again put at the disposal of the original owner. This perspective of having or being at someone's disposal is also determinative for most of the other occurrences of the qal and niphal. The houses of Jerusalem are counted to determine how many can be torn down to supply construction materials with which to strengthen the city walls during a siege (Isa. 22:10). That is, the specific goal is to determine which houses would be available for demolition in order to secure an effective defense.[12] According to 1 Ch. 23:3, the Levites were counted in order to assign them to different duties (vv. 4f.). This act of

9. → מנה *mānâ* (VII, 396-401).

10. See *WTM*, III, 573f. Cf. *MdD*, 335a. See II.1 below.

11. Cf. F. Zimmermann, "Some Studies in Biblical Etymology," *JQR* 29 (1938/39) 241f.; L. Kopf, "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen," *VT* 9 (1959) 268.

12. → נתץ *ntṣ*, II.4.

counting is thus first and foremost an expression of power, of having something or someone at one's disposal. A foreign ruler demonstrates his power over a subjected people by counting and weighing their tribute (Isa. 33:18a-bα). Solomon orders a census to provide labor for the temple construction (2 Ch. 2:1,16[2,17]). Here the enormously high numbers are also intended to demonstrate how great is his power over these people. By contrast, counting the number of defensive towers is supposed to demonstrate the invulnerability and power of Jerusalem (Ps. 48:13[12]; the addendum in Isa. 33:18bβ is dependent on the passage from the psalm).[13]

Statements concerning innumerability are to be understood similarly.[14] The assertion that Joseph stored up grain "in such abundance . . . it was beyond measure" (Gen. 41:49) demonstrates that Egypt now had access to virtually unlimited economic security and power with which to weather the coming years of famine. A people described as innumerable is understood to be enormously powerful and at the disposal of no other power in the world. Such was the promise of increase given to the patriarchs with regard to the Israel of the future (Gen. 15:5; 32:13[12]; cf. Hos. 2:1; in Gen. 16:10 this notion is transferred to the Ishmaelites, and in Jer 33:22 to the Davidides and the Levites). This notion of not being at someone else's disposal becomes especially clear in two passages that presuppose the fulfillment of this promise of increase: Nu. 23:10 (emended text)[15] in connection with v. 7, and 1 K. 3:8, according to which a people this numerous cannot be governed by an inexperienced king.

It is Yahweh who gives this promise of increase, he who bestows this immeasurable size on Israel. The promise and its fulfillment thus at once also attest that Yahweh is capable of things transcending by far all human understanding and action. The same applies to the notion of Jerusalem's invulnerability evoked by counting the city's defensive towers (Ps. 48:13[12]).[16] Whereas these statements address the idea of Yahweh's unsurpassed powers indirectly, Ps. 139:17f. address this specifically. His thoughts are unfathomable,[17] and cannot be counted. Within the overall context of the psalm, this means that human beings are utterly subject to him and experience this as his caring concern on the one hand, and as a burden on the other. The mention of innumerable sacrifices at the dedication of the temple (1 K. 8:5; 2 Ch. 5:6) also refers in a general and allusive fashion to Yahweh's greatness and power.

Only in isolated cases is Yahweh himself the subject of *spr*, and here, too, the issue is ultimately one of the power of disposal and decision. Thus does Yahweh count Job's steps, i.e., examines them to establish the details of Job's transgressions and then to decide accordingly concerning Job (Job 14:16;[18] 31:4). According to Ps. 56:9(8), he "counts" the psalmist's miseries, i.e., registers even their details that he might then in-

---

13. → מגדל *migdāl* II.2 (VII, 71f.).

14. Concerning the comparisons with sand and the stars, → חול *ḥôl (chôl)* II (IV, 265f.); → כוכב *kôkāḇ*, II.2 (VII, 80-82).

15. See I.1 above.

16. See previous discussion, esp. concerning vv. 2-9.

17. *yāqār*, → יקר *yāqar* III (VI, 285ff.).

18. See G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 259.

tervene and provide help. In this latter instance, *spr* could admittedly also have the meaning "keep count of."[19] This particular understanding is very likely reflected in Ps. 87:6, which alludes to recording items in a heavenly register (*kᵉṯāḇ*, emended text).[20] In Job 39:1f. the logical subject is Yahweh, who concerns himself with the time when wild animals give birth[21] and counts the months of their pregnancy. Although this is indeed an expression of his concern for them, within the overall context of the divine discourse (Job 38ff.) it ultimately demonstrates the sovereignty with which Yahweh also disposes over those spheres of nature that are inaccessible to human beings.

David's census of those fit for military service constitutes unauthorized human intervention into Yahweh's power of disposal over Israel (2 S. 24:10; 1 Ch. 21:2).[22]

2. *Piel and Pual.* In the piel and pual, *spr* has resultative meaning in the sense of "to count off, check" a group whose overall number is already fixed.[23] To the extent that a genuine counting procedure is meant, the same basic aspects remain determinative as for the qal and niphal. The petitioner beset by adversaries "counts off his own bones," i.e., grasps the full measure of his own suffering (Ps. 22:18[17]). But when Yahweh counts off or "numbers" (so NRSV) the clouds (Job 38:37) and gauges the wisdom that is inaccessible to human beings (Job 28:27),[24] or when by contrast his miracles and plans for human beings prove to be too numerous to count off (Ps. 40:6[5]),[25] all this demonstrates the boundlessness of his powers of disposal.

Elsewhere, the focus is less on the actual procedure of counting off than on the contents thus counted. Thus does Haman adduce his wealth and advantages in order to document his own influential status (Est. 5:11). Moses relates to the people all of Yahweh's ordinances, making clear thereby what obligations they will have toward Yahweh (Ex. 24:3). The believer enumerates all these ordinances themselves as a sign of his loyalty to Yahweh (Ps. 119:13; cf. by contrast Ps. 50:16). In its legal trial with Yahweh, Israel is to present (all) its arguments in order to demonstrate that it is in the right (Isa. 43:26).

All remaining occurrences deal exclusively with the process of relating or recounting (successively and fully) specific content, so that the piel can in the larger sense be rendered by "relate, tell" (commensurately also the pual in all its occurrences). Such content encompasses personal or shared experiences (Gen. 24:66; 29:13; Nu. 13:27; Josh. 2:23) and particularly significant events (1 S. 11:5; 1 K. 13:11), including falsification of events before a court (Ps. 59:13[12]).[26] Special and especially significant experiences include dreams one recounts for someone to interpret (Gen. 40:8f.; 41:8,12)

---

19. So also NRSV; cf. the gloss in v. 9b; on the origin of this meaning, see I.1 above.
20. See *BHS*; → כתב *kāṯaḇ*, IV.3 (VII, 376).
21. → ידע *yāḏaʿ*, III.1f. (V, 461ff.); → שׁמר *šāmar*.
22. See → מנה *mānâ*, II.1 (VIII, 397-99).
23. See *HP*, 128f.
24. → חכם *ḥāḵam (chākham)*, VI.2 (IV, 385).
25. → פלא *plʾ*; → חשׁב *ḥāšaḇ*, III.3 (V, 239f.).
26. → אלה *ʾālâ (ʾālāh)*, II.2 (I, 263); → כחשׁ *kāḥaš*, II.2 (VII, 134).

or that one passes on as a mysterious inspiration (Gen. 37:9f.; cf. also *mispār* in Jgs. 7:15) or as (alleged) divine revelation (Jer. 23:27f.,32).[27] According to Ps. 2:7, the king proclaims the divine decree sent to him.[28] In a more comprehensive sense, a petitioner recounts his ways to Yahweh in order to receive an answer (i.e., aid; Ps. 119:26).[29]

The most frequent content of such recounting, however, is Yahweh's mighty salvific deeds; this is especially the case in the psalms. Such recounting is not, however, a simple retelling in the sense of a reporting of one's experiences (so in Ex. 18:8). The salvific deeds one has either experienced oneself or learned from tradition are related in order to evoke and proclaim Yahweh's salvific activity in the broader sense. This means, however, that Yahweh is praised, and such recounting is thus commensurately attested especially in hymnic (in part usually eschatological) statements (Ps. 75:2[1]; 96:3 [= 1 Ch. 16:24]; Ps. 145:6 [emended text],[30] then expressly as a statement regarding the future in Ps. 102:[19],22[(18),23]; cf. Isa. 43:21), and especially in the vow of the individual as an element of the thanksgiving hymn and related statements (cohortative in the sg. Ps. 9:2,15[1,14]; 22:23[22]; 66:16; Sir. 51:1 [cf. Ps. 26:7]; Ps. 71:15; 73:28 [here also as a defense against being tempted to speak blasphemously about God, v. 15; cf. vv. 8-11]; 118:17; jussive in the pl. in 107:22; differently in the lament, 88:12[11]). Commensurately, *spr* in the piel parallels verbs such as *yāḏâ* hiphil (9:2[1]; cf. *tôḏâ,* 26:7; 107:22) and *hll* piel (22:23[22]; concerning other verbs, see esp. 145:4-7), or in its own turn takes the noun *t^ehillâ* as its object (9:15[14]; 102:22[21]; Isa. 43:21).[31] The salvific deeds themselves are described in a summary fashion as *niplā'ôṯ* (Ps. 9:2[1]; 26:7; 75:2[1]; 96:3 [1 Ch. 16:24]) or as *ma'^aśîm* (Ps. 107:22; 118:17; cf. *'āśâ* in 66:16), or are circumscribed with the noun *šēm* as an expression of Yahweh's greatness and might as manifested in such deeds (22:23[22]; 102:22[21]; Sir. 51:1; cf. also *g^eḏullâ* in Ps. 145:6, *kāḇôḏ* in 96:3 [1 Ch. 16:24], the aspect of Yahweh's concern and solicitation being expressed esp. in the nouns *ṣ^eḏāqâ* and *t^ešû'â,* Ps. 71:15, → חסד *ḥeseḏ* and *'^emûnâ,* 88:12[11]).[32]

Such deeds are recounted because they are of enduring significance as signs that Yahweh is concerned with those who are his and who trust in him; this cannot be called into question by distress or danger. As such, they have been and are to be recounted from generation to generation as a witness to this care and concern (Ps. 22:31[30], corrupted text? see *BHS*]; 44:2[1]; 48:14[13]; 78:3f.,6; 79:13; cf. Ex. 10:2; Jgs. 6:13; also Joel 1:3 [as the portrayal of a salvific deed][33]). Such witness, however, applies not only within Israel itself, for Yahweh is the Lord of the entire world, and his actions with re-

---

27. See I.1 above; → חלם *ḥālam (chālam),* III.2,4 (IV, 429, 430).
28. → חקק *ḥāqaq,* III.7 (V, 146f.).
29. → דרך *dereḵ (derekh),* V (III, 284-86).
30. See *BHS.*
31. → ידה *ydh,* III.1 (V, 431-39); → הלל *hll,* III.2, VI (III, 406f., 410).
32. → פלא *pl';* → עשׂה *'āśâ;* → שׁם *šēm;* → גדל *gāḏal (gādhal),* II.3.b (II, 400f.); → כבוד *kāḇôḏ* (VII, 22-38); → צדק *ṣāḏaq;* → ישׁע *yāša',* IV.4 (VI, 459-63); → אמן *'āman,* VII.2 (I, 316-20).
33. Cf. 2:18-27 and W. Rudolph, *Joel — Amos — Obadja — Jona. KAT* XIII/2 (1971), 41f.

gard to Israel and the individual have universal significance; similarly, he is active everywhere. Hence his salvific deeds are to be recounted in all the world (Ps. 96:3 [= 1 Ch. 16:24], expressly as future events in Ps. 102:22f.[21f.]; cf. Ex. 9:16). Because they, too, were made by the creator of the world, his works of creation also become the object of such stories (Ps. 19:2[1], though here nonhuman creations function as the subject; cf. by contrast the human subject in Sir. 42:15,17; 43:24).

According to prophetic proclamation, Yahweh can of course also act in ways that no one has ever heard recounted; such stories then encounter unbelief (e.g., the acts with regard to the Servant of God in Isa. 52:15; the subjection to the Chaldeans in Hab. 1:5).[34] By contrast, according to Ezk. 12:16 he will justify before all the world the catastrophe he has brought on Judah by having the survivors recount their own abominations *(tô'ēḇôṯ)*.[35]

In some passages in Job the use of *spr* reflects the special conflict between Job and Yahweh. In recounting to Job the terrible fate that comes upon (only) the wicked, Eliphaz offers as proof his own experience as well as that confirmed by tradition (15:17; cf. vv. 18-35). In Elihu's view Yahweh is so exalted that human beings can tell him nothing, and thus Job, too, can only turn to him in futility in his own conflict (37:20). But the animals can instruct human beings concerning Yahweh's creative power, power eclipsing human understanding (12:8; cf. vv. 7,9f., probably a secondary piece within Job's discourse).[36]

Only in isolated instances are the objects of such recounting or of praise (Sir. 31:11 [34:11]; 44:15) the deeds of human beings themselves as carried out with divine authority, or their behavior as informed by Yahweh's Spirit (e.g., the *g^e^ḏôlôṯ* that Elisha has done, 2 K. 8:4-6).

III. The Noun *mispār*. The noun *mispār* picks up the basic meaning of the verb and refers to the results of a particular procedure of counting or reckoning through which a specific entity is quantified precisely and completely.[37] Construed with the prep. *b^e^*, it can thus virtually acquire the meaning "(precisely) numbered off, counted out" (2 S. 2:15; 1 Ch. 9:28; Ezr. 8:34). Above all, however, it frequently refers to the results (sometimes broken down into individual sums) of an official census of specific groups of people or other entities, either after an explicit reference to a preceding census (persons: 2 S. 24:2,9; 1 Ch. 21:2,5; 23:3; 2 Ch. 26:11f.; other entities: Nu. 31:36 [cf. vv. 25,31]; Ezr. 1:9 [cf. v. 8]) or such that a census must be presupposed (persons: Jgs. 7:6; 1 Ch. 7:2,40; 12:24[23] [pl.]; 25:7; Ezr. 2:2 [Neh. 7:7]; Est. 9:11). It thus clearly signals the conclusion to a census or numbering as well as its completeness and precision. The same applies to the forms in Nu. 1 and 3 (1:2,18, etc.; 3:22, etc.), forms construed with the prep. *b^e^* and schematically repeated. Such a census, however, is conducted for

---

34. Concerning the understanding of *ta'^a^mînû*, → אמן *'āman*, V.4 (I, 300-303), though cf. also W. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), 203.

35. → תעב *tā'aḇ*.

36. See Fohrer, *Hiob*, 244f.

37. Concerning Jgs. 7:15, see I.1 and II.2 above.

a specific purpose (usually for determining which men are fit for military service; accordingly, the word group → פקד *pāqaḏ* often appears in these contexts).[38] That is, the results determine which groups of which entities are accessible in any given case such that one can decide concerning further measures involving them (concerning the latter, cf. Est. 9:11ff.). To that extent, the noun *mispār* at once reflects both the power of access and the power of decision attaching to a higher authority (corresponding thus to the verb in the qal and niphal).[39] The king as representative of the state is usually the one who functions as this authority. This is not fortuitous but rather an expression of the fact that a comprehensive and exact census, especially one dealing with such large numbers, is possible only in a community organized along the lines of a state with access to a corresponding bureaucracy.

Such a model for a state-authorized census has also influenced the examples cited from the book of Numbers (all P^G and P^S), though in this case it is Yahweh who prompts them and who in reality is the one making decisions concerning Israel. Furthermore, according to 1 Ch. 27:23f., the king as a human authority is in fact not authorized to carry out such a census or to enter the results in any annals.[40] It is for Yahweh alone to determine and measure Israel's size. This means, however, that it is he who possesses unlimited powers of disposal over this people (a secondary interpretation of 1 Ch. 21, one in its own turn augmented by v. 23aβ).[41]

In one series of occurrences, *mispār* refers specifically to a small number. In reference to persons (so esp. in the construction *m^eṯê* or *'anšê mispār*), this evokes the notion of powerlessness and of a threat to one's existence (Gen. 34:30; Dt. 33:6). On the one hand, in prophetic pronouncements the survival of a numerically tiny remnant can even signal the utter annihilation of an existing power through a catastrophe prompted by Yahweh (Isa. 10:19; 21:17;[42] cf. Dt. 4:26f.; according to Jer. 44:27f.[43] and Ezk. 12:16 it can simultaneously demonstrate the fulfillment of the divine oracle or articulate the justification for the catastrophe). On the other hand, after such a catastrophe precisely such a remnant preserved by Yahweh can also function as a sign of survival and thus of hope (Ezk. 5:3). Furthermore, Ps. 105:12 (1 Ch. 16:19) attests that in Israel's beginnings, Yahweh turned his attention to those who were indeed few in number and living an insecure existence, and through them demonstrated his power in its entirety (cf. vv. 13-15; the same applies to Jgs. 7:6 in comparison to the superior numbers of the enemy, vv. 9ff.).

A large portion of occurrences involves innumerable quantities, usually in the for-

---

38. Concerning 1 Ch. 23:3; Ezr. 1:8f., see II.1 above. The purpose of the list in Ezr. 2 (Neh. 7) is disputed; cf. K. Galling, *Studien zur Geschichte Israels im persischen Zeitalter* (Tübingen, 1964), 89-108.

39. See II.1 above.

40. Concerning v. 24bβ, see I.1 above.

41. See Rudolph, *Chronikbücher*, 183; concerning 1 Ch. 21 (2 S. 24), see II.1 above.

42. → שׁאר *šā'ar*.

43. Concerning the redactional-critical problems, see W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (^{3}1968), 263, though by contrast also W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45. WMANT* 52 (1981), 77-80.

mulation *'ên mispār*, i.e., inordinately high numbers. This expresses in a general fashion that the quantity in question is of extraordinary significance, or it alludes to the special significance of some other entity. The number of participants at a funeral reflects the status of the deceased (Job 21:33). By contrast, the opulence of a royal harem underscores the singularity of the one beloved (Cant. 6:8). Here too, however, the central focus is on the element of power and access. The quantity of grain reflects Egypt's enormous economic strength (Gen. 41:49).[44] The inestimable number of the enemy symbolizes a superior power threatening one's very existence (Jgs. 7:12; the abnormal number in 2 S. 21:20 also is the sign of special danger); that such disaster is imposed by Yahweh himself simultaneously demonstrates his superiority (Jgs. 6:5; 2 Ch. 12:3; Jer. 46:23; cf. the various contexts; the same applies to the locust plague described as an event of war in Joel 1:6; cf. also Ps. 105:34). In quite the reverse fashion, the inestimable number of the future Israel, illustrated graphically, demonstrates its extraordinary greatness and strength, and as a divine promise also Yahweh's immeasurable power (Hos. 2:1[1:10];[45] the fictitious high numbers in Nu. 1 and 3 possibly express this same aspect[46]).

Hymnic texts directly address Yahweh's power as the creator and Lord of the world. His "armies," the otherworldly powers at his disposal, are innumerable and immeasurable (*g^ed^ûḏîm*, Job 25:3). The same applies to his works of creation (Ps. 104:25; cf. v. 24; innumerable quantities [stars] also in Isa. 40:26; Ps. 147:4), his understanding (Ps. 147:5), his miracles (Job 5:9; 9:10), as well as to the demonstrations of his steadfast love and help, which know no bounds (*t^ešû'â*, Sir. 39:20; cf. v. 18).[47] Finally, allusions to Yahweh's greatness and power also include the Chronicler's statements concerning the immeasurable quantities of materials David readies for the construction of the temple (1 Ch. 22:4,16) and concerning the great quantities of sacrificial animals Josiah contributes for the Passover festival (2 Ch. 35:7; cf. 29:32).

The following passages address power of a different sort. On the one hand, Ps. 40:13(12) insists that it is the countless sufferings *(rā'ōṯ)* resulting from self-induced distance from God (cf. *'āwōn* in v. 13aβ) that, like a hostile power, threaten to destroy the individual. On the other hand, the almost unimaginable number of gods Israel now worships (Jer. 2:28; 11:13) is a sign of how far they have fallen away from Yahweh and how extensively they have subjected themselves to foreign powers.

One particular theme for which the noun *mispār* similarly acquires significance is that of time, since time, too, represents a quantifiable entity (cf. 1 S. 27:7; 2 S. 2:11). Here one encounters largely passages from wisdom literature, especially from the book of Job. They focus on the life of the individual human being as a limited span of time proceeding inexorably to its end (Job 16:22; 21:21; Sir. 33:24 [30:32]). It is Yahweh, however, who determines the length of this span, and for the beleaguered Job this means that it is transient, full of incomprehensible toil, and void of fulfillment (Job

44. See II.1 above.
45. See II.1 above.
46. See the preceding discussion.
47. → בין *bîn*, II.6 (II, 106); → פלא *pl'*; → ישע *yāša'*, IV.2.a (VII, 454f.).

14:5; cf. vv. 1-4,6-14). Similarly, Ecclesiastes is unable to offer anything apart from a few small joys that is good in the (brief) time of life measured out to human beings (Eccl. 2:3; 5:17[18]; 6:12). By contrast, Yahweh knows no temporal bounds and is thus inaccessible and inscrutable (Job 36:26; cf. the ironic statement in 38:21). Hence it is merely impotent posturing when Job claims he can number his own steps, i.e., give an account of his entire life, for all practical purposes thereby equating himself with (but in reality placing himself above) Yahweh (31:37).[48] It is a similar expression of powerless despair when Job attempts to eliminate the day of his birth and in so doing change the calendar into a numerically fixed entity (3:6). Contradicting Job, Eliphaz emphasizes that only the wicked must face a (brief) life full of horrors (15:20), thus presupposing the traditional view that correct behavior leads to a long and fulfilled life (cf. Ex. 23:26). Although Sirach also emphasizes that the span of human life is limited and thus capable of only limited fulfillment, he immediately adds that those who have acquired a good name (Sir. 41:13) or have benefited others through their wisdom instead of merely themselves (37:25; cf. vv. 22f.) will live on, as it were, in a temporally unlimited fashion (and under favorable conditions even life itself can be unusually long, 26:1).

Only in isolated instances does *mispār* as a concept of time refer to Israel as a whole. According to Dnl. 9:2, Yahweh himself determined the duration of the exile, and Israel's apostasy from Yahweh is thus viewed as being so grievous precisely because it has been going on for such an inconceivably long time (Jer. 2:32). Sir. 33:8f. (36:8f.) offers a qualitative evaluation in distinguishing between festival days and (merely) numbered (i.e., ordinary) days. Yahweh himself appoints this distinction, and through this act, too, shows that he is the Lord of time.

Finally, *mispār* also indicates the numerical agreement or correspondence between two entities. Here the notion of precision is determinative (cf. 2 Ch. 26:11). Certain standards can also be set in such instances. The manna to be gathered corresponds to the number of Israelites; i.e., only what is necessary for their survival is to be collected (Ex. 16:16; cf. also Jgs. 21:23). The purchase price for real estate or for slaves is considered just only if the number of years till the Year of Jubilee is taken into consideration, i.e., the time still available for use (Lev. 25:15f.,50). The success of sympathetic magic depends on the numerical correspondence between the images of the plague and those who are affected (1 S. 6:4,18a).[49] Sacrifices are appropriate and efficacious when the number corresponds to the obtaining ordinances (Ezr. 3:4; other examples of requisite correspondence are in Nu. 15:12; 29:18ff.; cf. also Job 1:5). A specific sin, as something capable of quantification, corresponds to a specific punishment (Nu. 14:34; Dt. 25:2). Ezk. 4:5 mentions a reverse correspondence; the number of days Ezekiel must lie on his side reflects the measure of Israel's guilt.[50]

In some instances certain relationships and connections are disclosed. The number

48. Concerning counting one's steps, see also II.1 above.
49. For details, see the comms. in loc.
50. Concerning Ezk. 4:4-8, see W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), in loc.

of nations corresponds to that of "the sons of the gods"; i.e., every nation is subjected to one of them (Dt. 32:8, emended text).[51] The equal number of stones and tribes of Israel shows that the events portrayed here are of significance for all the tribes (Josh. 4:5,8; 1 K. 18:31; commensurately, according to Sir. 45:11, Aaron is responsible for all the tribes).

IV. Qumran. In the Qumran texts the verb *spr* occurs only in isolated instances in the qal (counting off days in 4QOrd[c] (4Q514) 1:1,3;[52] 11QT 18:10,12; 19:13, etc.), but then approximately 40 times in the piel (including 17 in 1QH, here also once in the pual). As in the OT, all these passages are concerned with hymnic praising and proclamation of God's salvific deeds and greatness. Thus here, too, the contents include God's *niplā'ôṯ* (1QH 1:30,33; 3:23, etc.; 4QShir[b] [4Q511] frs. 63-64, 2:2[53]), *kāḇôḏ* (1QH 11:6; 12:30; 13:11; fr. 2, 4), *ṣᵉḏāqôṯ* (1QS 1:21; 10:23; 1QH 17:17), *ḥᵃsāḏîm* (1QH 11:28), and *gᵉḇûrôṯ* (1QH 18:23; 4QDibHam[a] [4Q504] frs. 1-2, 6:9[54]). Compared with OT usage, however, these terms have in part acquired different values or special accentuation.[55] One concept or term specific to the Qumran texts is *rāz,* "mystery" (as the object of *spr* in 1Q30 4:1).[56] The close connection with the word group *yāḏa'* is noteworthy (esp. in 1QH, e.g., 10:20; 11:28; 12:29f.; 18:23; cf. 1QS 10:24 [*'str* being emended to *'spr* in the mss.]; 4QShir[b] frs. 63-64, 2:2[57]).

What must be specially emphasized, however, is that such "telling" or "recounting" has universal significance. The subject is basically the circle of the Qumran community, frequently represented by an "I" (so esp. in 1QH, e.g., 10:20; 11:6; 17:17; cf. 4QShir[b] frs. 63-64 2:2[58]), occasionally also by members of certain offices (priests, Levites in 1QS 1:21f., the *mbqr* in CD 13:7f.;[59] by contrast, 1QH 18:23 mentions heavenly beings [*ṣb' d't*[60]]). Addressees, however, are by no means limited to the Qumran community (so the "many" in CD 13:7f.),[61] and include human beings in general (1QH 11:6; 18:23; cf. *kwl m'śykh* in 1QH 1:33; 3:23; also *dwrwt 'wlm* in 1QH 6:11; 4QDibHam[a] frs. 1-2, 6:9; 7:3 is probably to be understood in a universal sense[62]). The content of such "recounting" can also be human sin and guilt in contrast to God's salvific deeds and greatness (1QS 1:22f.; 10:23f.; cf. 1QH 1:25).

In 1QpHab 2:9 *spr* refers to God's own revelation (similarly also the pual in 1QH

---

51. → בן *bēn,* IV.2.c (II, 157ff.).
52. *DJD,* VII, 296.
53. *DJD,* VII, 247.
54. *DJD,* VII, 148.
55. See the corresponding articles.
56. *DJD,* I, 133; concerning *nhywt 'wlm* in CD 13:8, → היה *hāyâ (hāyāh),* II.3 (III, 375f.).
57. *DJD,* VII, 247; see S. Wagner, 248f.; → ידע *yāḏa',* III.5 (V, 481).
58. *DJD,* VII, 247.
59. See *HAL,* I, 151.
60. → צבא *ṣāḇā'.*
61. → רבב *rāḇaḇ.*
62. See *DJD,* VII, 148, 160; S. Wagner, 249.

1:23). The noun *mispār*, occurring about 15 times in the Qumran writings, exhibits the same semantic spectrum as in the OT.

Conrad

סֹפֵר *sōpēr*

Contents: I. Ancient Near East: 1. Egypt; 2. Mesopotamia; 3. Ugarit; 4. Phoenician-Punic, Aramaic, and Moabite Witnesses. II. Etymology and OT Occurrences. III. OT Use: 1. Early Monarchy; 2. Late Monarchy; 3. Exile; 4. Postexilic Period. IV. LXX.

---

sōpēr. J. Begrich, "Sofer und mazkir, ihre Herkunft und Bedeutung für das Reich Davids und Salomos," *ZDMG* 86 (1933) 10*; idem, "Sōfēr und Mazkīr," *ZAW* 58 (1940/41) 1-29 = *GSAT. ThB* 21 (1964), 67-98; H. Brunner, *Altägyptische Erziehung* (Wiesbaden, 1957), 10-55, 66-69, 71-74; G. Castellino, "'Scriba velox' (Ps XLV, 2)," *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch. FS J. Ziegler. FzB* 2 (Würzburg, 1972), 29-34; A. Cody, "Le titre égyptien et le nom propre du scribe de David," *RB* 72 (1965) 381-93; P. Colella, "Baruch lo scriba e Jerahmeel il figlio del re," *BiOr* 23 (1981) 87-96; A. D. Crown, "Messengers and Scribes: The ספר and מלאך in the OT," *VT* 24 (1974) 366-70; M. Dietrich and O. Loretz, "Ämter und Titel des Schreibers ILMLK von Ugarit," *UF* 12 (1980) 387-89; R. P. Dougherty, "Writing upon Parchment and Papyrus Among the Babylonians and Assyrians," *JAOS* 48 (1928) 109-35; W. Eilers, "Keilinschriften und antike Rechtsgeschichte," *OLZ* 34 (1931) 922-37, esp. 931-33; A. Falkenstein, "Der 'Sohn des Tafelhauses,'" *WO* 1 (1947/52) 172-86; idem, "Die babylonische Schule," *Saeculum* 4 (1953), 125-37; K. Galling, "Die Halle des Schreibers," *PJ* 27 (1931) 51-57; idem, "Tafel, Buch und Blatt," *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W. F. Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), 207-23, esp. 222f.; M. Heltzer, *The Internal Organization of the Kingdom of Ugarit* (Wiesbaden, 1982), 156-61; H.-J. Hermisson, *Studien zur israelitischen Spruchweisheit. WMANT* 28 (1968), 97-136; W. J. Horwitz, "The Ugaritic Scribe," *UF* 11 (1979) 389-94; J. Jeremias, "γραμματεύς," *TDNT*, I, 740-42; J. Klima, "L'apport des scribes mésopotamiens à la formation de la jurisprudence," *Folia Orientalia* 21 (1980) 211-20; S. N. Kramer, "Schooldays: A Sumerian Composition Relating to the Education of a Scribe," *JAOS* 69 (1949) 199-215; J. Krecher, "Schreiberschulung in Ugarit: Die Tradition von Listen und sumerischen Texten," *UF* 1 (1969) 131-58, esp. 131-33; J. Kühlewein, "סֵפֶר *sēper* book," *TLOT*, 806-13; B. Landsberger, "Babylonian Scribal Craft and Its Terminology," *Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Orientalists* (Cambridge, 1954), 123-26; idem, "Scribal Concepts of Education," *City Invincible: A Symposium on Urbanization and Cultural Development in the Ancient Near East*, ed. C. H. Kraeling and R. M. Adams (Chicago, 1960), 94-102; B. Lang, *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority. SWBA* 1 (1983), 138-56; B. Maisler, "The Scribe of King David and the Problem of the High Officials in the Ancient Kingdom of Israel," *Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society* 13 (1946/47) 105-14; W. McKane, *Prophets and Wise Men. SBT* 1/44 (London, [2]1966), 23-47; T. N. D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials. CB* 5 (1971), 7-51; R. Meyer and K. Weiss, "φαρισαῖος," *TDNT*, IX, 11-48, esp. 21-23; J. Muilenberg, "Baruch the Scribe," *Proclamation and Presence. FS G. H. Davies* (Richmond, 1970), 215-38; J. P. J. Olivier, "Schools and Wisdom Literature," *JNSL* 4 (1975) 49-60; A. L. Oppenheim, "A Note on the Scribes in Mesopotamia," *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger. AS* 16 (1965), 253-56; H. Otten, "Hethitische Schreiber in ihren Briefen," *MIO* 4 (1956) 179-89; E. Otto, "Bildung und Ausbildung im Alten Ägypten," *ZÄS* 81 (1956) 41-48; O. Procksch, "Der hebräische Schreiber und sein Buch,"

I. Ancient Near East.

1. *Egypt.* In Egypt the totality of education at large derives from the scribal schools, which began in the Old Kingdom with the royal school for the education of princes. Scribes were also required for the development of a comprehensive state administrative apparatus, and their tasks included the reckoning and registering of taxes, the preparation of census lists for military work and projects at the front, as well as computations for larger construction projects.[1] The Middle Kingdom had a government school for training court secretaries, while during the later period one no longer hears of any such central school at the palace itself, since those particular vocational groups in which one learned reading and writing now trained their own successors.[2] Beginning with the New Kingdom, witnesses mention temple schools, suggesting again that every vocational group (as with the priests here) trained its successors itself.[3]

The king's own scribe composed laws and decrees perhaps according to dictation, though in contrast to Mesopotamia, the king in Egypt was himself able to write.[4] The king's scribe was responsible for diplomatic correspondence in foreign policy matters, for which Akkadian was used.[5] The Amarna letters mention a *ṭupšar šarri* as a representative of the Egyptian administration.[6]

The apprentice scribe earned the title "scribe," attested in the form *sš* or *sẖ*, after four years of training.[7] Egyptian adopted the Canaanite designation *sù-pur(a)* as a loanword;[8] similarly, the title *sù-pu-ur ya-di-ʿa* appears in Papyrus Anastasi I.[9]

Von Büchern und Bibliotheken. FS E. Kuhnert (Berlin, 1928), 1-15; A. F. Rainey, "The Soldier-Scribe in Papyrus Anastasi I," *JNES* 26 (1967) 58-60; idem, *The Scribe at Ugarit: His Positions and Influence. Proceedings of the Israelite Academy of Sciences and Humanities* III/4 (Jerusalem, 1968); R. Rendtorff, "Esra und das 'Gesetz,'" *ZAW* 96 (1984) 165-84; E. Rivkin, "Scribes, Pharisees, Lawyers, Hypocrites: A Study in Synonymity," *HUCA* 49 (1978) 135-42; U. Rüterswörden, *Die Beamten der israelitischen Königszeit. BWANT* 117 (1985), 85-89; H. H. Schaeder, *Esra der Schreiber. BHT* 5 (1930), 39-59; W. Schenkel, "Schreiber," *LexÄg,* V, 698-700; N. Schneider, "Der dub-sar als Verwaltungsbeamter im Reiche von Sumer und Akkad zur Zeit der 3. Dynastie von Ur," *Or* 15 (1946) 64-88; J. A. Soggin, "Note on Two Derivatives of the Root SPR in Hebrew," *OT and Oriental Studies. BietOr* 29 (1975), 184-87; H. Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter. WUNT* II/6 (1980), 216-93; R. de Vaux, "Titres et fonctionnaires égyptiens à la cour de David et de Salomon," *RB* 48 (1939) 394-405; M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford, 1972), 158-71; R. J. Williams, "Scribal Training in Ancient Egypt," *JAOS* 92 (1972) 214-21.

1. Williams, 214; Mettinger, 140-43.
2. Olivier, 55; Hermisson, 103-7.
3. Otto, 41-42.
4. Williams, 215; Brunner, 50; Rüterswörden, 87f.
5. Mettinger, 45-47; Williams, 219.
6. EA, 286:61; 287:64; 288:62; 289:47.
7. *WbÄS,* III, 475, 479-81; Williams, 216.
8. Rüterswörden, 87.
9. Rainey, "Soldier-Scribe," 58f.; A. Malamat, "Military Rationing in Papyrus Anastasi I and the Bible," *Mélanges bibliques. FS A. Robert. Travaux de l'Institut Catholique de Paris* 4 (1957), 115 n. 10.

2. *Mesopotamia.* In Akkadian, scribes bore the title *ṭupšarru(m)* borrowed from Sum. *DUB.SAR,*[10] and their tasks ranged from the temple and palace to the community and scholarly learning in the larger sense. The result was that the *ṭupšarru(m)* was one of the central figures of Mesopotamian civilization.[11] Lexical lists distinguish fifteen categories of *DUB.SAR* according to training and specialization.[12] This Sumerian title of "scribe" could also function as an honorific title for the king.[13] In addition, all the king's incoming and outgoing correspondence passed through the hand of the scribe; as a result, the scribe, as a secretary of the king, occupied a key position at the court.[14] This is also why some letters are addressed directly to scribes or contain postscripts to them.[15]

As early as the Sumerian period, scribal schools existed for training scribes *(É.DUB.BA);* an apprentice scribe attended these schools as a "son of the tablet house" *(DUMU.É.DUB.BA),*[16] and this tradition was continued in the training of Akkadian scribes.[17] During the Sumerian period, these schools originated within the framework of the temple economy, whereas during the Old Babylonian period the training of scribes passed into the hands of individual families.[18]

Palace administration distinguished between the *ṭupšar ekalli,* who was counted among the dignitaries, and the individual secretaries attached to various administrative officials.[19] It is worth noting that the kings, priests, provincial governors, and judges were themselves usually unable to write.[20]

During the Old Babylonian period there were not only scribes at the court itself but also street scribes for hire to anyone for money.[21] That the title "scribe" is attested especially on seals shows that the scribe also functioned as a notary.[22] During the Old Babylonian period there were also female scribes *(ṭupšarratum)* in both Sippar and Mari.[23] The Aramaic loanword *sepīru/sepirru,* "translator-scribe," is also attested in Neo- and Late Babylonian.[24]

---

10. Landsberger, "Scribal Craft," 123-26; *AHw,* III, 1395f.
11. Oppenheim, 253.
12. Landsberger, "Concepts," 97; idem, "Scribal Craft," 125f.
13. Falkenstein, "Schule," 133; idem, "Sohn," 172.
14. Oppenheim, 253; Olivier, 50f.
15. For the former see *ARM,* II, 132; XIII, 47-52; EA, 286-89; cf. Oppenheim, 254f. For the latter cf. Oppenheim, 256, on *ABL* 1250, 17-22; 688, 15-17.
16. Falkenstein, "Sohn," 183; Kramer, "Schooldays," 199.
17. Olivier, 49.
18. For the former see Falkenstein, "Sohn," 186; for the latter, Landsberger, "Concepts," 97.
19. P. Garelli, "Hofstaat," *RLA,* IV, 449, 451.
20. Landsberger, "Concepts," 98.
21. Ibid., 99.
22. Schneider, 64-79.
23. *AHw,* III, 1395b.
24. *AHw,* II, 1036b; concerning the scribe in Mesopotamia, cf. esp. Krückmann, "Beamter," *RLA,* I, 451, §22; Ebeling, "Beamter," *RLA,* I, 452, §§7, 15; Opitz, "Beamter," *RLA,* I, 458, §4; 463, §20; Garelli, "Hofstaat," *RLA,* IV, 449, §4; H. Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone. AOAT* 2 (1968); Otten, 181-89.

3. *Ugarit.* In Ugarit the root *spr* is attested with the derivatives *spr* G/D, "write, tell"; *spr,* "writing, letter"; *spr,* "enumeration, list, number"; and *spr,* "scribe, notary."[25] The title *spr* appears especially in the poetic colophons.[26] One particular colophon reveals that the scribe of the epics, a certain *Ilmlk,* was the pupil of the high priest.[27] Hence in contrast to Mesopotamia, the scribal school in Ugarit was still associated with the temple.[28]

The title *ṯʿy* used parallel to *spr* in some colophons probably refers neither to the person who examined the texts nor to some clan designation but rather to the title of a courtier.[29]

Scribal training followed the path of its Babylonian precursor, which is why the Ugaritic scribe also composed Akkadian, Sumerian, and Hittite texts.[30] The designation *spr* refers both to the scribal copyist and to the independent author.[31] According to this distinction, the individual called Ilimilku several times in the colophon is to be classified as a copyist rather than as an author.[32]

The compound *rb spr* is used to refer to the chief scribe.[33] Besides designating the scribe by the title *spr,* Ugaritic witnesses also attest the titles *ṭupšarru* and *sukallu.*[34] In addition to composing larger texts, the Ugaritic scribe also functioned as a notary public by composing legal documents, lists, and administrative texts, as well as diplomatic correspondence.[35] Several witnesses show that the office of scribe was passed down from father to son.[36]

4. *Phoenician-Punic, Aramaic, and Moabite Witnesses.* The register of the temple administration of Kition (Kittim) contains the title *rb sprm,* "chief scribe";[37] that this person worked in the service of the temple is demonstrated by the fact that he was paid out of temple funds. The title *rb spr(m)* attested in Ugarit and in Punic inscriptions shows that temple scribes were ranked hierarchically.[38] The title *spr* appears frequently in Aramaic inscriptions; the *spr* functions in connection with legal documents and as a notary.[39]

---

25. *WUS,* no. 1947.
26. *KTU,* 1.16, VI, 59; 1.4, VIII, 49; 1.6, VI, 54; 1.17, VI, 56.
27. *KTU,* 1.6, VI, 54-58.
28. Rainey, "Scribe," 128; Rüterswörden, 126.
29. Dietrich and Loretz, 387f. See *KTU,* 1.16, VI, 59; 1.4, VIII, 49. Cf. *WUS,* no. 2908; Rainey, "Scribe," 128.
30. Krecher, 133.
31. Horwitz, 390f.
32. Ibid., 391-94.
33. *KTU,* 1.75, 10; cf. esp. *KAI,* 37A:15.
34. Heltzer, 156f.
35. Rainey, "Scribe," 139-41; Heltzer, 157.
36. Rainey, "Scribe," 128f., 144f.
37. *KAI,* 37A:15.
38. *KTU,* 1.75, 10; *RES,* 891, 4; Delcor, "Le personell du Temple d'Astarté," *UF* 11 (1979) 160 and n. 101.
39. *DNSI,* II, 798f.; *KAI,* 227, rto. 6; 236, rto. 6.

Although nothing much can be gleaned about the significance and function of the title from its use in some inscriptions,[40] the use of the title *spr* in the Words of Ahiqar acquires more distinct contours insofar as Ahiqar refers to himself simultaneously as *spr ḥkm wmhyr* (1:1) and as a keeper of the seal (1:7), positions his nephew also has (2:18-20). Ahiqar's status is described further as *y'ṭ wspr ḥkm* (2:27-28; 3:35-36, 42; cf. 1 Ch. 27:32).

Witnesses in Elephantine mention the *spry 'wṣr'* and the *spry mdynt'*.[41] Additionally, the formulation "PN + *spr*" is found as a colophon in the documents from the 5th century.[42]

Two Moabite seals also mention the title *spr*, and here, too, the scribe seems to have functioned as a notary.[43]

II. Etymology and OT Occurrences. The subst. *sōpēr* is a *qōṭēl* construction of the verb *sāpar*.[44] Its radicals suggest that it has an Akkadian morphological equivalent in *šāpirum*, "instruction giver,"[45] though the lack of semantic equivalency should be noted, since *šāpirum* does not refer to a scribe.[46] Hence the following etymological possibilities for *sōpēr* emerge: (1) *sōpēr* is a denominative of → *sēper*, so that the *sōpēr* is to be viewed as the author of a list;[47] (2) it derives deverbally from → *sāpar*, "count" or "write," though here one must note that *sāpar* only rarely has the meaning "write" and is attested only by late witnesses with this meaning;[48] (3) it derives etymologically from *šāpirum*, with a semantic development into "scribe" prompted by historical or sociological factors.[49] This view has the advantage of accounting for the morphological equivalence of *sōpēr* and *šāpirum* and for the semantic difference between the two lexemes. Such a relationship between *sōpēr* and *šāpirum* can also be found in Jgs. 5:14, where the *šēbeṭ sōpēr* is to be understood as a "marshal's staff."[50]

Although the title *sōpēr* does not occur in the Pentateuch, the word does occur 13 times in the Deuteronomistic history, 3 in Isaiah, 12 in Jeremiah, twice in Ezekiel, twice in Esther, once in the Psalms, and 20 times in the Chronicler's history, for a total of 53 occurrences. The occurrence of *sōpēr* in Jgs. 5:14 is to be distinguished from these.[51]

---

40. E.g., *KAI*, 266:9; 249:3.
41. *AP*, 2:12, 14; 17:1, 6.
42. Cf. G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, ²1957), 4:4; 6:6; 7:10; 8:6; 9:3; 10:5. For additional Aramaic witnesses, cf. Beyer, 648.
43. Colella, 92.
44. Soggin, 186.
45. Soggin, 186f.; McKane, 25f.; Schaeder, 39, 45f.; *KBL*², 1104; no longer in *HAL*, II, 765f.
46. Mettinger, 43; Dougherty, 115f.; Eilers, 932; *AHw*, III, 1172f.
47. Mettinger, 45.
48. Mettinger, 44f.; *GesB*, 550f.; Kühlewein, 163; Dougherty, 114.
49. McKane, 25-27.
50. J. A. Soggin, *Judges. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1981), 82, 89.
51. Ibid.; M. Tsevat, "Some Biblical Notes," *HUCA* 24 (1952) 107.

Apart from OT occurrences, *sōp̄ēr* also appears a number of times on seals.[52]

III. OT Use.

1. *Early Monarchy.* The *sōp̄ēr* occurrences in 2 S. 8:17; 20:25; 1 K. 4:3 are to be dated to the early monarchy and come from the Davidic-Solomonic lists of officials. The first of these lists mentions the office of the *sōp̄ēr* behind that of the head of the army, the recorder, and the priests. By contrast, the second Davidic list of officials (2 S. 20:23-26) ranks the military offices behind that of the *sōp̄ēr.* The Solomonic list (1 K. 4:1-6) exhibits several changes, the most important of which is that the priest is mentioned first, then two *sōp̄ᵉrîm,* and only then the recorder. The *sōp̄ᵉrîm* mentioned here are sons of the *sōp̄ēr* mentioned in 2 S. 8:17 and 20:25, suggesting a certain continuity of the scribal office within a single family of the sort also observed outside Israel. Like the offices paralleling *sōp̄ēr,* so also is the *sōp̄ēr* a → שׂר *śar,* i.e., a high official of the king.[53] To that extent, even though sources from the early monarchy do not reveal much about the actual tasks of the *sōp̄ēr,* this official was clearly not a simple scribe but rather the head of the royal chancellory.[54] One cannot determine whether the heads of the royal chancellory under David and Solomon were Egyptians (as their names might suggest) or whether the Egyptian scribal title was incorrectly understood as a personal name.[55]

The parallel between *sōp̄ēr* and *mazkîr* in 2 S. 20:24f. and 1 K. 4:3 has prompted some to assume a close connection between these two offices.[56] Both officials occupied the highest offices in the civil administration, and only during the time of Hezekiah were these eclipsed by the office of the *'ᵃšer 'al-habbayiṯ.*[57]

2. *Late Monarchy.* The tradition of the *sōp̄ēr* as the head of the royal chancellory at court can be followed during the late monarchy as well. According to 2 K. 18:18,37 (cf. Isa. 36:3,22), the *sōp̄ēr* along with the person in charge of the palace and the recorder all belonged to the emissaries of King Hezekiah to Sennacherib, and in 2 K. 19:2 (cf. Isa. 37:2) to the emissaries to the prophet Isaiah. The position of the *sōp̄ēr* can be illuminated further here through comparisons with *The Journey of Wen-Amon to Phoenicia* such that in this context the *sōp̄ēr* is not to be understood as an emissary.[58] The parallel between *sōp̄ēr* and *mazkîr* in these passages, one already attested in the early monarchy as well (2 S. 8:16f.; 20:25; 1 K. 4:3), also militates against this. Shebnah, whom 2 K. 18:18,37 calls *sōp̄ēr,* is in part identified with the Shebnah in Isa.

---

52. P. Bordreuil, "Inscriptions sigillaires ouest–sémitiques II," *Syr* 52 (1975) 107-18; N. Avigad, *Bullae and Seals from Post-Exilic Judean Archives* (Jerusalem, 1976), 7-8, no. 6; A. Lemaire, "Essai sur cinq sceaux phéniciens," *Sem* 27 (1977) 33; N. Avigad, "Baruch the Scribe and Jerahmeel the King's Son," *IEJ* 28 (1978) 53.

53. Rüterswörden, 85ff.

54. Procksch, 2; Mettinger, 42; Rüterswörden, 88f.

55. De Vaux, 398-400; Cody, 387-93.

56. De Vaux, 394-400; Crown, 369f.; H. Eising, → זכר *zāḵar (zākhar)* (IV, 64-82).

57. Mettinger, 13.

58. Rüterswörden, 88 n. 127; *ANET,* 25-29; contra Crown, 368.

22:15-19, who here acquires the title *'ašer 'al-habbayit*, and who, because a different person occupies this office in 2 K. 18:18,37, is allegedly degraded to the status of *sōpēr*.[59]

Jer. 36:10,20 mention the "chamber of the scribe" (NRSV "of the secretary"), i.e., the royal chancellory in which the king's secretary discharged his duties and thus also where the archives were kept.[60] According to Jer. 37:15,20, some portion of the house of the *sōpēr* was arranged as a prison.[61] If the *sōpēr* in these passages is to be understood as in the early monarchy, namely, as the head of the royal court chancellory, then the seals dating to this period suggest that the *sōpēr* who is to be understood as a "scribe" was a public official with the power of the seal.[62] It is questionable whether Jer. 8:8 attests the existence of a circle of *ḥakāmîm sōperîm* who occupied ministerial or priestly offices.[63] At most this might say something about the didactic and religious function of the *sōperîm*,[64] a function then especially evident during the postexilic period.

The term *ṭipsār* is attested twice in the 7th century (Nah. 3:17; Jer. 51:27); it, too, refers to the scribe and is to be viewed as a loanword from Akk. *ṭupšarru*.[65] The first passage (Nah. 3:17) refers to an administrative official, the second (Jer. 51:27) to a scribe in a military context who is to be understood here as a conscription official.

3. *Exile*. The occurrences of *sōpēr* dating to the exilic period (2 K. 12:11[Eng. v. 10]; 22:3,8,9,10,12) all reflect the preexilic usage according to which the title *sōpēr* refers to the head of the royal chancellory. Ezk. 9:2,3 refer in a broad sense to scribes, and the *qeseṯ hassōpēr* to the scribe's container or writing palette (NRSV "writing case") or instrument.[66]

4. *Postexilic Period.* Not until the postexilic period does the term *sōpēr* exhibit any semantic change. The Aramaic text Ezr. 7:12-26 adduces Ezra's title as *kāhanā' sāpar dāṯā' dî-'elāh šemayyā'* (vv. 12,21). Here the title of priest used in the *status determinatus* clearly refers directly to Ezra, while the title *sāpar* refers to what follows. The term *dāṯ* is to be viewed not as a parallel to *tôrâ* but rather as a specialized expression from the vocabulary of royal law,[67] with the *sāpar dāṯā'* referring to a Persian office title.[68] This also applies to the use of the Hebrew title *sōpēr* in connection with

---

59. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13-27* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1997), 384.
60. Mettinger, 33; Galling, "Halle," 51-57; Muilenberg, 228f.
61. Rüterswörden, 86.
62. Colella, 93.
63. See Weinfeld, 158; W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 61; J. Lindblom, "Wisdom in the OT Prophets," *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East. FS H. H. Rowley. SVT* 3 (1955), 195f. For the ministerial see P. A. H. de Boer, "The Counsellor," *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East*, 42-71, here 61f. For the priestly see Hermisson, 131.
64. Weinfeld, 162.
65. M. Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words in the OT* (London, 1962), 78f.; Mettinger, 51.
66. *GesB*, 719; *HAL*, III, 1116.
67. Rendtorff, 167-69.
68. Ibid., 172f., 182.

Ezra (Neh. 8:1,4,9,13; 12:26,36), paralleled in part by the title *kōhēn* (Neh. 8:1f.,9; 12:26), especially since there is no connection in Ezr. 7 between the use of the title *sōpēr* and any public reading of the *tôrâ*.

This use of *sōpēr/sāpar* in reference to a Persian office title is to be distinguished from those expressing a person's familiarity with the Holy Scriptures. Ezra is described as *sōpēr māhîr bᵉtôraṯ mōšeh* (Ezr. 7:6) and as *sōpēr diḇrê miṣwōṯ-yhwh wᵉḥuqqāw 'al-yiśrā'ēl* (7:11). The connection between the title *sōpēr* in these passages and the *sōpēr* title in the sense of a Persian office, one otherwise associated with Ezra, is unmistakable, revealing the compositional function of 7:6,11 through which the image of the officeholder Ezra from Neh. 8:1,4,9,13 is now associated with the image of Ezra in Ezr. 7.[69] Ezr. 7:6,11 understand the title *sōpēr* as "scriptural scholar," one then picked up by rabbinic literature.[70]

Ezr. 7:6 also influenced the ideal of the messianic ruler in Isa. 16:5, which understands this ruler as *dōrēš mišpāṭ* (cf. Ezr. 7:10) and *mᵉhîr ṣeḏeq* (cf. 7:6) in analogy to the *sōpēr* of the postexilic period.[71]

During the postexilic period, 1 Ch. 27:32 also uses the title *sōpēr* in a list of officials to refer to such scholarly expertise parallel with the term *yō'ēṣ*, and because this usage has no correspondence in the Deuteronomistic history, it should be viewed as specific to the Chronicler.

The construct expression *sōpēr māhîr* in Ezr. 7:6 in reference to knowledge of the Holy Scriptures occurs in the absolute position in Ps. 45:2(1), where the title *sōpēr māhîr* refers to the "ready scribe" (NRSV). The model for the Hebrew formulation is the Akkadian title *ṭupšarru emqu*.[72]

During the postexilic period, the term *sōpēr* is used to refer to the "state scribe" or "secretary" (2 Ch. 24:11; 26:11; 34:15,18,20) as well as to the "scribe" (1 Ch. 24:6; 34:13; Neh. 13:13; Est. 3:12; 8:9), and this usage can be followed through the talmudic period.[73]

Twice in the postexilic period the PN *sōpereṯ* appears (Ezr. 2:55; Neh. 7:57), a name similarly referring in the intensive sense to the scribe.[74] Sir. 38:24–39:11 compares the vocation of the *sōpēr*, a person devoted to the law and utterly taken by the fear of the Lord, with that of a tradesman or craftsman. The text mentions the wisdom of the *sōpēr* (38:24), wisdom that remains closed off to the farmer, tradesman, or artisan because of their workload. The activity of the *sōpēr* is characterized by a study of the law (38:34b) and by the wisdom of ancients (39:1f.). This earns the *sōpēr* respect among the powerful and great, and among later generations (39:4-11).[75]

---

69. Ibid., 182.
70. Lang, 144; Rendtorff, 181f.
71. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27*, 144.
72. Rüterswörden, 87; concerning the alleged reading of this title in Papyrus Anastasi I, see Rainey, "Soldier-Scribe," 58-60.
73. E. Levine, "The Transcriptions of the Torah Scroll," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 99f.; *WTM*, III, 574f.
74. Mettinger, 51.
75. Cf. Meyer-Weiss, 23; Castellino, 30f.; Stadelmann; Lang, 148-52.

The title *sōpēr* is not attested in Qumran.

IV. LXX. The LXX translates *sōpēr* with *grammateús,* referring both to the secretary and scribe and (in the usage of the Chronicler's history) to the person knowledgeable in the law.[76] The NT is the last witness to this use of *sōpēr/grammateús,* since both Philo and Josephus no longer use *grammateús* to refer to the scriptural scholar.

The LXX renders the expression *sōpēr māhîr* in Ps. 45:2(1) with *grammateús oxýgraphos,* and in Ezr. 7:6 with *grammateús tachýs.* The LXX omits the title *sōpēr* from 2 K. 22:9; Jer. 36:20,21 (LXX 43:20,21).[77]

Niehr

---

76. Jeremias, *TDNT,* I, 740; Rivkin, 138-42.
77. Mettinger, 21 n. 7.

סֵפֶר *sēper*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. LXX. II. General Considerations: 1. Medium of Scripture; 2. Medium of Tradition. III. OT: 1. Letters; 2. Historical Records; 3. Prophetic Books; 4. Written Law: a. JE; b. Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic; c. P; d. Chronicler; 5. Heavenly Books; 6. "Literature, Letters." IV. Qumran

---

sēper. S. Amsler, "Loi orale et loi écrite dans le Deutéronome," *Das Deuteronomium,* ed. N. Lohfink, BETL 68 (1985), 51-54; H. Balz, "βιβλίον," "βίβλος," *EDNT,* I (1990), 217f.; A. Baumgarten, "The Torah as a Public Document in Judaism," *SR* 14 (1985) 17-25; G. Braulik, "Die Ausdrücke für 'Gesetz' im Buch Deuteronomium," *Bibl* 51 (1970) 39-66; V. Burr, *Bibliothekarische Notizen zum AT* (Bonn, 1969); W. Dietrich, "Josia und das Gesetzbuch (2 Reg. XXII)," *VT* 27 (1977) 13-35; C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot. BBB* 62 (1985); H. Donner, "Jes 56,1-7. Ein Abrogationsfall innerhalb des Kanons," *Congress Volume, Salamanca 1983. SVT* 36 (1985), 81-95; K. Ehlich, "Text und sprachliches Handeln: Die Entstehung von Texten aus dem Bedürfnis nach Überlieferung," *Schrift und Gedächtnis: Archäologie der literarischen Kommunikation, I,* ed. A. Assmann et al. (Munich, 1983), 24-43; K. Galling, "Tafel, Buch und Blatt," *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W. F. Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), 207-23; S. Greidanus, "The Universal Dimension of Law," *SR* 14 (1985) 39-51; A. H. J. Gunneweg, *Mündliche und schriftliche Tradition* (Göttingen, 1959); H. Haag, "Die Buchwerdung des Wortes Gottes in der heiligen Schrift," *Mysterium Salutis,* I (Einsiedeln, 1965), 289-427, 440-59; idem, "Das 'Buch des Bundes' (Ex 24,7)," *Das Buch des Bundes: Aufsätze zur Bibel und zu ihrer Welt,* ed. B. Lang (Düsseldorf, 1980), 226-33; H. D. Hoffmann, *Reform und Reformen. ATANT* 66 (1980); F.-L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog. OBO* 45 (1983); L. Koep, *Das himmlische Buch in Antike und Christentum. Theophaneia* 8 (Bonn, 1952); idem, S. Morenz, and L. Leipoldt, "Buch," *RAC,* II

I. 1. *Etymology.* No genuinely unified semantic field can be assigned to the Semitic root *spr,* which occurs throughout the Semitic languages. Semantic differences emerge not only between the individual language groups in the larger sense but even more so between different verbal and nominal uses within individual languages or groups. The scope of these semantic differences is so considerable that linear etymological derivations are to be rejected outright, even within a single language group. One is better advised to seek possible connections to other Semitic languages in each individual case.

Two semantic focal points can be discerned for the root *spr* in the Semitic languages: first, the meaning "count, etc."; second, "piece of writing, writer, etc." Both meanings occur in Biblical Hebrew, with the first attaching to the verbal stem → ספר *sāpar* with its derivatives and to → ספר *sōpēr.*[1]

Apart from Biblical Hebrew, the only other individual language attesting the root *spr* with these two meanings together is Ugaritic.[2] The frequently adduced occur-

---

(1954), 664-731; J. Kühlewein, "סֵפֶר *sēper* book," *TLOT,* II, 806-13; G. Lanczkowski, P. Welten, and D. Fouquet-Plümacher, "Buch/Buchwesen," *TRE,* VII, 270-90; B. Lang, "From Prophet to Scribe: Charismatic Authority in Early Judaism," *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority. SWBA* 1 (1983), 138-56; A. Lemaire, *Vom Ostrakon zur Schriftrolle. Überlegungen zur Entstehung der Bibel. ZDMGSup* 6 (1985), 110-23; C. Levin, "Joschija im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk," *ZAW* 96 (1984) 351-70; G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. WMANT* 39 (1971); J. Liver, "The Book of the Acts of Solomon," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 75-101; N. Lohfink, "Die Bundesurkunde des König Josias," *Bibl* 44 (1963) 261-88, 461-98; idem, "Die Bibel: Bücherei und Buch," *Jahrbuch Deutsche Akademie für Sprache und Dichtung* II (1983), 50-64; idem, "Die Sicherung der Wirksamkeit des Gotteswortes durch das Prinzip der Schriftlichkeit der Tora und durch das Prinzip der Gewaltenteilung nach dem Ämtergesetz des Buches Deuteronomium," *Testimonium Veritati. FS W. Kempf. FThS* 7 (1971), 143-55; W. McCready, "A Second Torah at Qumran?" *SR* 14 (1985) 5-15; A. R. Millard, "La prophétie et l'écriture: Israël, Aram, Assyrie," *RHR* 65 (1985) 125-45; F. Nötscher, "Himmlische Bücher und Schicksalsglaube in Qumran," *RevQ* 1 (1958) 405-11 = *BBB* 17 (1962), 72-79; L. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im AT. WMANT* 36 (1969); H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982); G. Rinaldi, "Alcuni termini ebraici relativi nella litteratura 45," *Bibl* 40 (1959) 282f.; W. Röllig, "Die altorientalischen Literaturen," in Röllig et al., *Altorientalische Literaturen. Neues Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft* 1 (Wiesbaden, 1978), 9-24; H. P. Rüger, "Schreibmaterial, Buch, Schrift," *BRL*², 289-92; G. Schrenk, "βίβλος, βιβλίον," *TDNT,* I, 615-20; H. H. Schaeder, *Esra der Schreiber* (Tübingen, 1930; repr. 1968); R. Smend, "Das Gesetz und die Völker," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 494-509; H. Spieckermann, *Juda unter Assur in der Sargonidenzeit. FRLANT* 129 (1982); M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford, 1972); C. Wendel, *Die griechisch-römische Buchbeschreibung verglichen mit der des Vorderen Orients* (Halle, 1949); T. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung. FRLANT* 106 (1972); I. Willi-Plein, *Vorformen der Schriftexegese innerhalb des ATs. BZAW* 123 (1971); W. Wimmel, *Die Kultur holt uns ein: Die Bedeutung der Textualität für das geschichtliche Werden* (Würzburg, 1981); E. Zenger, "Ps 87,6 und die Tafeln vom Sinai," *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch. FS J. Ziegler. FzB* 2 (1972), 97-103; idem, *Israel am Sinai: Analysen und Interpretationen zu Exodus 17–34* (Altenberge, 1982; ²1985).

1. For the first see *GesB,* 550f.; *HAL,* II, 765f. For the second, *GesB,* 550, as ptcp. of *sāpar; HAL,* II, 767, as independent lemma.

2. *WUS,* no. 1947; *UT,* no. 1793.

rences in the South Semitic languages remain restricted to one or the other meaning for a specific language, e.g., Old South Arabic/Ethiopic "to measure; standard," or Arabic "book, etc." This observation, however, does not yet justify an internal etymological derivation within Northwest Semitic such that a noun *sēper* with the basic meaning "enumeration, list," might derive from the verbal stem *spr* in the meaning "count."[3] Rather, one should keep in mind the special status of Ugaritic as a Canaanite language strongly influenced by foreign languages (including East Semitic);[4] the double meaning found in Hebrew was originally already present in Ugaritic. This double meaning either represents a peculiarity of Ugaritic itself or is the result of other linguistic influences. Morphologically equivalent East and West Semitic lexemes with differing semantic elements may possibly have encountered one another here.

Except for the more recent Semitic languages, the other West Semitic languages also primarily assign the word field "writing material, writer" to *spr*.[5] Considering also that the meaning "count" attaches largely to the common Semitic word *mnw/y*,[6] the most probable derivation of Heb. *sēper/sōpēr* is the one originally presented by F. Hommel and repeatedly adduced since: from Akk. *šipru/šāpiru*.[7] In addition to the verb *šapāru*, "send, write," Akkadian also includes the corresponding nominal derivations *šipru*, "commission, message, work," and *šāpiru*, "instruction giver."[8] Several southern Babylonian documents also attest the Aramaic loanword *sipru*, "document."[9] The sound shift *š* > *s* presents no problem here, and might even go back to the Assyrian sibilant shift (ca. 1100 B.C.; cf. also Amor. *śpr*, "to send, to be beautiful"), which was not consistently implemented in cuneiform writing.[10]

The semantic development from "commission, message" to "document, inscription" on to "book" suggested by this derivation does not present any real problems if one considers the basic cultural-historical and communication-theoretical developments accompanying the development of writing.[11]

Dohmen

---

3. So T. N. D. Mettinger, *Solomonic State Officials. CB* 5 (1971), 42-45.

4. Cf. D. Kinet, *Ugarit: Geschichte und Kultur einer Stadt in der Umwelt des ATs. SBS* 104 (1981), 47-58.

5. Cf. in Phoenician-Punic *KAI,* 1:2; 24:14f.; 37A:15; 50:6 — Aramaic; *DNSI,* II, 799f.; Beyer, 648.

6. → מנה *mānâ* (VIII, 396-401).

7. Hommel, *NKZ* 1 (1890), 69. Concerning the various suggestions since Hommel, cf. Kühlewein, *TLOT,* II, 806; *HAL,* II, 765f.; W. Eilers, "Zur Funktion von Nominalformen," *WO* 3 (1964/66) 127; S. A. Kaufmann, *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic. AS* 19 (1974), 29.

8. *AHw,* III, 1170f., 1245f., 1172f., 1589.

9. *AHw,* II, 1049.

10. Cf. I. J. Gelb, *Computer-Aided Analysis of Amorite. AS* 21 (1980), 32; Beyer, 100f. n. 1; G. Garbini, "The Phonetic Shift of Sibilants in Northwestern Semitic in the First Millennium B.C.," *JNSL* 1 (1971) 32-38.

11. See II.2 below.

2. *Occurrences.* The word *sēper* occurs 185 times in the OT, with 52 occurrences in Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic texts (11 in Deuteronomy, 7 in Joshua, 1 in 1 Samuel, 3 in 2 Samuel, 16 in 1 Kings, 44 in 2 Kings) and 23 in parallels in 2 Chronicles.

The frequent use of *sēper* in prophetic writings (12 in Isaiah, 26 in Jeremiah, 1 each in Ezekiel, Nahum, and Malachi) reflects the process of committing prophetic words to writing. Here, too, numerous occurrences can be traced back to Deuteronomistic redactors (see below).

Statistical studies add the following occurrences: 1 in Genesis, 4 in Exodus, 2 in Numbers, 3 in the Psalms, 2 in Job, 1 in Ecclesiastes, 11 in Esther, 5 in Daniel, 9 in Nehemiah, 1 in 1 Chronicles.

3. *LXX.* The LXX almost always translates *sēper* with *biblíon* or *bíblos,* not distinguishing (as also in contemporary Greek) between *bíblos,* "book," and the original diminutive form *biblíon,* "little book."[12] Only in isolated instances does the LXX translate *sēper* with an eye on the context and with other Greek terms, such as *grámma, grammatikós, epistolḗ, lógos,* or *syngraphḗ.*

II. General Considerations.

1. *Medium of Scripture.* Each of the various writing systems of the ancient Orient, especially Mesopotamian cuneiform and Egyptian hieroglyphs, settled on a preferred means of committing words to writing, i.e., on a preferred writing medium.[13]

The emerging consonantal writing in Palestine quickly developed a preference for the book in the form of leather or papyrus scrolls for Hebrew when faced with committing longer texts to writing, as was presumably the case especially for the emergence of the OT.[14] The OT does mention the tablet as writing material, but 35 of those 45 occurrences involve the tradition of the tablets of the law at Sinai.[15] Although written Hebrew seals and ostraca have indeed been found at archaeological sites in Israel,[16] their use was probably restricted to daily matters and did not extend to the process of committing the biblical tradition to writing.

2. *Medium of Tradition.* With regard to the emergence of holy scriptures or writings, it is precisely for the "religions of the Book" that the process of committing such traditions to writing plays a decisive role. Quite apart from addressing the possibilities and limitations of oral and written traditions as such,[17] every investigation of the phenomenon "book religion" must deal with the questions of the origin and emergence of texts.

Contrary to the definition of texts as any form of speech act, a definition popular in modern linguistics, K. Ehlich tries to distinguish more precisely by designating as

---

12. Cf. Schrenk, *TDNT,* I, 615.
13. Cf. Röllig, 16ff.; I. J. Gelb, *A Study of Writing* (Chicago, ^{2}1963), 60ff.
14. Cf. Beyer, 72-76; Rüger, 291.
15. → לוח *lûaḥ* (VII, 480-83). See 4.a below; → סיני *sînay,* V.3.
16. Cf. Lemaire, 110ff.
17. Cf. Wimmel.

"text" only those particular speech acts preserved for a wider (in contrast to the original) language context.[18] Accordingly, a text is characterized by being "stable beyond the actual speech situation";[19] i.e., its characteristic feature is the capacity for transmitting or passing on the original speech act. The point of departure for understanding a text in this way is the institution of the messenger, since the messenger overcomes a diatropic and thus also a diachronic impediment to the original language situation.[20]

In asking what generates this need for transmitting a given content, one finds a strong need for "tradition" in this sense not only in daily registers such as those deriving especially from daily economic life (presumably harboring the beginnings of writing itself), but also in the sphere of law and cult.[21] The texts generated by this need for transmitting certain material constitute the foundation for the subsequent development of tradition. By being fixed in written form, these texts allow later creative and constructive engagement with that material. This in its own turn allows one to understand the status of the "book" as a medium of transmission more precisely as the most significant form in which to summarize different speech acts. In the case of the Bible as Holy Scripture in contrast to separately collected cult rubrics, legal texts, or narratives, it represents a salient witness to theologically motivated assemblage of tradition.

III. OT.

1. *Letters.* In several passages the context suggests that *sēp̱er* is best translated as "letter" (2 S. 11:14,15; 1 K. 21:8,9,11; 2 K. 5:5,6,7; 10:1,2,6,7; 19:14; 20:12; 2 Ch. 32:17; Est. 1:22; 3:13; 8:5,10; 9:20; 25:30; Isa. 37:14; 39:1; Jer. 29:1,25,29). It is written and sent to someone,[22] who then reads it *(qr')*. Extrabiblically, *sēp̱er* also exhibits this meaning on several Lachish ostraca.[23] Letters mentioned in the OT, except for those in Jeremiah, are always written and sent by kings or higher officials. Although Galling's explanation that "if a letter was intended for several recipients . . . one spoke of 'letters'" is accurate, it still does not explain the plural in 2 K. 19:14; 20:12; Isa. 37:14; 39:1.[24] Because in these passages the letter is written by Assyrians, and because letters were frequently written in cuneiform on several tablets,[25] here, too, *s^epārîm* is probably to be understood as several pieces of writing.

Dt. 24:1,3; Isa. 50:1; Jer. 3:8 refer specifically to the letter of divorce (NRSV "certificate of divorce"), and Jer. 32:10,11,12,14,16,44 to the letter as a purchase contract. Hence in these instances *sēp̱er* refers to a legal document.

---

18. P. 32.
19. P. 37.
20. Cf. Ehlich, 31, as well as the discussion of the etymology of Heb. *sēp̱er* in I.1 above.
21. Cf. the so-called Mesopotamian counting stones, D. Schmandt-Besserat, "The Earliest Precursor of Writing," *Scientific American* 238/6 (1978) 38-47. For Egyptian cf., e.g., W. Schenkel, "Wozu die Ägypter eine Schrift brauchten," *Schrift und Gedächtnis,* ed. A. Assmann et al. (Munich, 1983), 45-63.
22. → כתב *kāṯaḇ* (VII, 371-82); → שׁלח *šālaḥ 'el.*
23. *KAI,* 193; 195; 196.
24. P. 220.
25. → לוח *lûaḥ* (VII, 480-83); cf. *AHw,* III, 1395.

2. *Historical Records.* In conclusion to their accounts of the era of a particular king, 1-2 Kings mention books in which additional details about that king might be found. They usually use formulaic expressions whose basic form is: *w^e yeṯer diḇrê PN (w^e kōl) 'ᵃšer 'āśâ hᵃlô'-hēm k^e ṯuḇîm 'al-sēper diḇrê hayyāmîm l^e malḵê yiśrā'ēl* or *y^e hûḏâ* (1 K. 11:41; 14:19,29; 15:7,23,31; 16:5,14,20,27; 22:39,46; 2 K. 1:18; 8:23; 10:34; 12:20; 13:8,12; 14:15,18,28; 15:6,11,15,21,26,31,36; 16:19; 20:20; 21:17,25; 23:28; 24:5). Only in the case of Solomon are the final three words omitted; it reads simply *diḇrê š^e lōmōh* (1 K. 11:41). This reveals that the writers were familiar with a book specifically about the history of Solomon.

Four passages omit the *hᵃlō'-hēm* (1 K. 14:19; 2 K. 15:11,15,31). Most variations occur after *'ᵃšer 'āśâ,* and can include an insertion after the deeds of the king in question. The expression *sēper diḇrê hayyāmîm* occurs not only in Kings but also in Neh. 12:23; Est. 2:23; 6:1; 10:2, where it refers to records of daily events, i.e., to royal annals.[26] 1-2 Kings use this both as a source and as a bibliographical reference. The difference between the titles suggests two different books were present at the royal courts.[27]

Chronicles recasts the material from Kings according to its own theology and reports only the histories of the kings of the southern kingdom. In the process it doubly alters the source references from 1-2 Kings first with the apposition "from first to last" (2 Ch. 16:11; 20:34; 25:26; 28:26; 35:27; without this apposition only in 24:27; 27:7; 32:32), and second with changes in content regarding the kings' deeds.[28] Chronicles cites prophetic sources to emphasize the significance of kings Solomon (9:30), Rehoboam (12:15), Abijah (13:22), Jehoshaphat (20:34), Uzziah (26:22), and Hezekiah (32:32). Each instance involves a king distinguished in the Chronicler's view by a special proximity to David (esp. noticeable in the insertion 12:5f.). Even if several prophets are mentioned as authors of a particular royal history, only one receives the title *nāḇî'* and thereby also special authority.[29] Hence in the passages mentioned, Chronicles replaces the source references from 1-2 Kings with references to prophetic sources. In the remaining passages of this sort as well, Chronicles exhibits more variations than does Kings, with only the beginning *(w^e yeṯer diḇrê PN)* and ending *('al-sēper malḵê y^e hûḏâ w^e yiśrā'ēl)* remaining relatively constant. Even though Chronicles reports concerning the kings of the southern kingdom only, it understands them as kings of the entire people, and thus speaks of both *yiśrā'ēl wîhûḏâ.* The topoi "History [NRSV 'Book'] of the Kings of Israel" and "Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah" refer to the same source.[30] The same applies to the midrashim in 2 Ch. 24:27, which do not, contrary to S. Mowinckel and F. Michaeli, refer to an independent source to which the Chronicler had access quite apart from the canonical

26. → דבר *dāḇār (dābhar)* (III, 84-127).

27. M. Rehm, *Das zweite Buch der Könige* (Würzburg, 1982), 257.

28. Willi, 108.

29. R. Micheel, *Die Seher- und Prophetenüberlieferungen in der Chronik. BET* 18 (1983), 79.

30. Ibid., 75.

books of Kings.[31] These source references serve the interpretation of the Deuteronomistic source information, in the process bestowing on the entire corpus of the Chronicles the character of a midrash.[32]

A *sēper* in Ex. 17:14; Nu. 21:14; Josh. 10:13; and 2 S. 1:18 contains historical accounts of military events. These are probably victory songs of the sort found in the songs of Deborah and Miriam celebrating Yahweh as the victorious warrior God.[33]

The occurrence of *sēper* in the lists of Gen. 5:1; Josh. 18:9; and Neh. 7:5 reveals a certain chronological interest. Here, too, the connection with the beginnings of writing becomes evident in the form of registers.[34]

3. *Prophetic Books.* The process of committing spoken material to writing has a special function with regard to the prophets even though prophetic proclamation as such is always directed primarily to a specific situation (cf. the significance of → דבר *dāḇār* for the prophets). The prophets' words are committed to writing not because of any literary ambition but rather as a stopgap solution.[35]

Isa. 8:1 contains one of the earliest remarks concerning such writing. Although it involves only a brief oracle, it (like 8:16) does offer a reason for committing such material to writing. Because the prophet's proclamation was unsuccessful, he is forced to preserve his message in hope of finding a more receptive audience in the future. Committing it to writing is the most secure means of insuring its preservation.[36] Isa. 30:8ff. articulates this intention explicitly; Isaiah writes his message on a tablet and in a *sēper* as a witness for the future. This also means that the vitality and power of the Yahweh message as whose mediator the prophet views himself is no longer bound to the particular proclamatory situation;[37] it is now of enduring significance (cf. also Hab. 2:2).

The book of Jeremiah describes with particular thoroughness this process whereby the prophet's words are written down in a book. By dictating his auditions to his scribe Baruch, who writes them down on a scroll (*m^egillaṯ sēper;* Jer. 36:4), he insures their continuation beyond the present. This is Jeremiah's last attempt to bring about Israel's repentance (36:3). Through being fixed in written form, the prophet's word is to acquire an objective power independent of the actual speaker.[38]

The following portrayal of the book's fate makes even more dramatic the Jeremianic theme of the great disaster.[39] The renewed, expanded version of the writing (Jer. 36:32; cf. 45:1), however, underscores the impossibility of destroying Yahweh's

31. Willi, 231ff. Cf. Mowinckel, "Erwägungen zum chronistischen Geschichtswerk," *TZ* 85 (1960) 1-8; Michaeli, *Les livres des chroniques, d'Esdras et de Néhémie. CAT* XVI (1967), 207.

32. Willi, 233; O. Kaiser, *Intro. to the OT* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1975), 243f.

33. N. Lohfink, "The Strata of the Pentateuch and the Question of War," *Theology of the Pentateuch* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1994), 179f.

34. Cf. II.2.

35. Cf. K. Koch, *The Prophets,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1983-84), I, 163-68.

36. Cf. Gunneweg, 34.

37. Cf. G. von Rad, *OT Theology,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans., New York, 1962-65), I, 43, 45.

38. Cf. Gunneweg, 38.

39. Von Rad, *OT Theology,* I, 44f.

word. Not even throwing the book into the Euphrates can change this (51:63). Jeremiah, too, is convinced that the *d^e^bārîm,* like the *tôrâ* (see below), "can become fundamental, enduring instructions,"[40] and for this reason are written in a book (25:13; 30:2; 51:60,63). As the verbatim citation of Mic. 3:12 in Jer. 26:18 shows, Jeremiah already had access to a written version of the book of Micah. When the prophets' oracles are not immediately fulfilled, writing them down is the only and most important way of demonstrating later the truth of their words.[41]

The *sēper* already acquires enormous significance for Ezekiel at his calling. Indeed, he must internalize (literally; Ezk. 2:8–3:3) the oracle of judgment ("lamentation and mourning and woe") in the form of a scroll (*m^e^gillat sēper,* 2:9). In contrast to both Isaiah and Jeremiah, who later write down (or have someone else write down) their oral proclamation, Ezekiel receives his book right at the beginning of his prophetic mission.

In part, the prophets themselves already wrote down various individual texts, oracles, and visions; the prophets' pupils, concerned that their masters be acknowledged, then assembled these into the books we have today (cf. Nah. 1:1).[42]

The book of Jeremiah is already engaged within the OT itself, in Dnl. 9:2. This late work already has access to several prophetic books that can be described as *s^e^pārîm,* and the same applies to Sirach, who has access to the entire prophetic canon (e.g., Sir. 49:10).

4. *Written Law.* This central section is concerned with illuminating the important traces of the early process of writing evident especially in the Pentateuch.This development is revealed in part by the occurrences of *sēper* in connection with legal regulations, though one must also draw on information associated with → כתב *kātab* and לוח *lûaḥ.*

a. *JE.* By introducing the stone tablets into the Sinai theophany, JE is the oldest pentateuchal stratum to mention material being fixed in writing.[43] In Ex. 24:12* and 31:18*, the tablets serve JE to "announce theophany and sacrifice."[44] In Ex. 34:27 Yahweh prompts Moses to write down the covenant terms precipitated by the theophany (34:11-26), and to make them the basis of the covenant. JE views here in the covenant terms the oldest written version of a text of the law within the framework of its Sinai theophany encompassing Ex. 19–34.[45] Because the tablets of the law function only as an announcement for JE, nothing is said about their content.

The Deuteronomistic/P redaction picks up the motif of the stone tablets and identifies them as the tablets of the covenant, of the law, etc., and is the first stratum to associate the Decalog with them. For R^P in Ex. 24:12*, it is the *tôrâ* that is written on those tablets. The decisive problem is determining the actual content and scope of this *tôrâ,* which is also written down in the *sēper* (see below).

40. Gunneweg, 44.
41. Cf. Millard, passim.
42. Cf. F.-L. Hossfeld and I. Meyer, *Prophet gegen Prophet. BibB* 9 (1973), 162.
43. Hossfeld, 145ff.
44. Cf. Dohmen, 138.
45. Ibid., 140.

b. The Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic literature is numerically and substantively the most revealing with regard to texts of the law, and in this context the reform account in 2 K. 22f. acquires particular significance. Here one notices both the frequent occurrence of the word *sēper* itself (11 times) as well as the central role the book plays in the course of the narrative. The finding of the book is recounted, and v. 8 identifies the book as the *sēper hattôrâ,* presupposing it thus as something already familiar. The book they find contains statements that make the king "tear his clothes" (v. 11) because "the words of this book" (v. 13) were not followed. The result of finding this book is Josiah's reform (2 K. 23:4-27), whose center is a centralization of the cult. In this context the "words of the *tôrâ*" in the *sēper* legitimize the elimination of "foreign cults" (v. 24). In 2 K. 23 the same book is said to contain the obligatory contents of a covenant, and the *sēper* itself is described as *sēper habbᵉrîṯ* (v. 2).

This particular designation is attested only 3 times. In 2 K. 23:2 the *sēper habbᵉrîṯ* is the covenant document. Since only here is the *sēper habbᵉrîṯ* organically interwoven with the events of the narrative, it was probably already part of the original source or *Vorlage.*[46]

Late Deuteronomistic redactors inserted it from here into v. 21, according to which it contained the prescriptions for the Passover. The content of both passages can be explained in connection with the account of the finding of the book.

The third occurrence is Ex. 24:7. Here, in analogy to familiar ancient oriental contracts, it represents the document of a contractual covenant between two partners (Yahweh and Israel), with Moses as mediator and with an accompanying ritual of sealing in v. 8.[47] The book contains "the words of Yahweh" (v. 4); hence the text Moses writes into the *sēper habbᵉrîṯ* is 20:22–23:33.[48] Redaction-critical considerations especially suggest this, since 24:6-8 corresponds to Deuteronomistic covenant theology and derives from the same Deuteronomistic redactors that inserted the overall Book of the Covenant into its present location.[49]

By adding the Book of the Covenant, these redactors make it into the premier legal text of the Sinai-Horeb theophany. The Decalog of Dt. 5 remains untouched in its status as the basic law, while Deuteronomy now is classified as the second law in the literal sense and in this position interprets both the Book of the Covenant and the Decalog.[50]

2 K. 22f. uses *sēper hattôrâ, sēper habbᵉrîṯ,* and simple *sēper* in free variation such that one cannot distinguish them either from the literary or from the redaction-critical perspective.[51] This variability reflects on the one hand the redactors' struggle to determine the correct name for the book in question, and shows on the other hand how they

46. Spieckermann, 73.
47. Perlitt, 195.
48. Hossfeld, 194; a different view is taken by Haag, 227.
49. Zenger, *Israel,* 154; cf. also Spieckermann, 77f.
50. Hossfeld, 194.
51. Spieckermann, 51.

equate the book that was reported found both with the book of the law and with the book of the Josiah covenant.

Both the contents as described and additional information suggest that the reference here is either to Deuteronomy itself or to certain parts of it.[52] The expression "book of the law" (2 K. 22:8,11) recalls Dt. 12–26. Nor can one exclude the Decalog in Dt. 5. 2 K. 22:11 suggests that Dt. 28 also belongs in this *sēper*.[53] The expression *sēper hattôrâ* presupposes that the law is a text that can be identified precisely. The emergence of this notion of a fixed, written document of the will of Yahweh presupposes the presence of a text already viewed as canonical. Hence if one can determine when this notion is first attested as well as its scope and context, one can say something about when and how the law was committed to writing.

The identification of the Josianic book of the law with Deuteronomy in the preexilic account of the reform suggests that one look first at the occurrences in Deuteronomy. An initial look at Deuteronomy in its entirety reveals that many texts are based on an oral form of transmission. Moses speaks (e.g., Dt. 1:1; 5:1; 29:1[Eng. v. 2]); the people listen (e.g., 4:1; 26:16-19) and are instructed to recite and talk about this material further (e.g., 6:7). The fiction of Moses' discourse acquires particular significance for the composition of Deuteronomy. The entire basic stratum of Dt. 5–28 involves exclusively oral transmission.

Dt. 6:4-9 and, dependent on it, 11:18-21 seem to contradict this.[54] The anaphoric understanding in 6:6, however, applies back to the words in 6:4f., and thus the reference in 6:8f. also exclusively to 6:4f. The significance of oral tradition exhibited in v. 7 is striking despite the existence of written confessional statements. It is not enough merely for the individual believer to read! Oral transmission takes priority, especially in the reading of holy texts during worship.

The core Deuteronomic law in Dt. 12–26 mentions a book of the law only once. Although the royal law in 17:14-20 stipulates that the monarch always have a copy of the law for reading (v. 18), this represents a late Deuteronomistic insertion into the Deuteronomic law on kingship. Since the Levitical priests are the guardians of the law, it is they who acquire controlling function over the king. Mention of a *mišnēh hattôrâ ʿal sēper* presupposes familiarity with 31:9,26 (see below). Because the demand for obedience to the written version of Deuteronomy is also typical of late Deuteronomistic redaction, 17:18 cannot be adduced as proof that Deuteronomy existed originally in a written form.[55]

The transition from oral to written tradition becomes clear in the addition of the tablets (Dt. 4:13; 5:22; 9:10,15; 10:10-5) by a late Deuteronomistic redactor (following JE)[56]

---

52. Preuss, 5, with bibliography.
53. A different view is taken by Levin, 369, who identifies the "book of the *tôrâ*" in 2 K. 22f. with the Pentateuch.
54. Cf. H. Donner, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel und seiner Nachbarn in Grundzügen. ATD Erg.* 4/2 (1985), 355.
55. Ibid., 353f.
56. See II.a.

and especially in 31:9aα. Dt. 31:9aα is part of the following conception of the Deuteronomistic historian:[57] Moses announces the *ʿēḏôṯ, ḥuqqîm,* and *mišpāṭîm* in Beth-peor (4:45,46a). He finishes speaking these words (31:1f.), they are written down as *tôrâ* (v. 9aα), and they are entrusted to the Levites. This strikingly simple description of the process of committing this material to writing reflects exactly the transition from oral to written tradition. "Dt. 31:9a draws the ultimate conclusion from the Deuteronomic fiction of Moses' discourse, namely, that Moses not only spoke but also wrote."[58] The reworking of 2 K. 22f. by the same Deuteronomistic redactor may also be exerting some influence on this conclusion.

It is only by way of subsequent Deuteronomistic redactors that the *tôrâ* finds its way into the *sēper.* One characteristic of this situation is that all the occurrences of *sēper* in Deuteronomy are in late Deuteronomistic, background-framing texts (in addition to the occurrences of *sēper* as *nomen regens* in construct combinations with *tôrâ* as *nomen rectum* in Dt. 28:61; 29:20[21]; 30:10; 31:26, which are to be considered along with the neighboring verses 28:58; 29:19,26[20,27]; 31:24).

This reveals when a *sēper hattôrâ* emerged. The notion of a finished, written version of Yahweh's will is characteristic of late Deuteronomistic redaction.[59] The exact scope of this work described as the book of *tôrâ,* however, remains in question. Only a precise examination of the individual passages can determine this.

The rather circumstantial formulation in Dt. 28:58 is striking. Instead of speaking simply about the book of the law as does 2 K. 22f., it refers to *kôl-diḇrê hattôrâ hazzōʾṯ hakkᵉṯûḇîm bassēper hazzeh.* Through this choice of words the author is clarifying with extreme precision the relationship between *sēper* and *tôrâ* as well as introducing the expression *sēper hattôrâ,* which in the following texts is already being used as a *terminus technicus.* The formulation with *sēper hazzeh* suggests that this author views this text itself (Dt. 28:58) as belonging to the *tôrâ.*

In Dt. 28:61 the emphasis on *tôrâ* through the use of *hazzōʾṯ* as a demonstrative pronoun is singular among the occurrences of the expression *sēper hattôrâ.* This may possibly refer to a somewhat more remote legal text and simultaneously be attempting to show that the verse itself is not found in the *sēper.* Because this consideration is based merely on this one verse, however, nothing certain can be concluded.

The text-critical apparatus of *BHS* shows that the distinction between *hazzeh* and *hazzōʾṯ* is already overlooked in many Hebrew mss. as well as in the LXX and Vulgate. While the LXX always attaches the demonstrative pronoun to the law *(toú nómou toútou),* thus taking the exception of Dt. 28:61 as the rule, Hebrew mss. emend *hazzōʾṯ* into *hazzeh* and thus eliminate the distinction.

In all remaining occurrences (Dt. 29:19,26[20,27]; 30:10; 31:24,26), the law and the book constitute a single entity, the reference text being Dt. 5–28*. Moses writes the words of this *tôrâ* into a book (31:24) and entrusts this to the Levites. The late

---

57. See M. Noth, *The Deuteronomistic History. JSOTSup* 15 (Eng. trans. 1981), 34f.; Perlitt, 41.

58. Perlitt, 117.

59. Cf. Perlitt, 42; Spieckermann, 56.

Deuteronomistic portrayal of the emergence of the written law differs from that of the Deuteronomistic history through a certain degree of circumstantiality designed to emphasize the length and import of the text. At the same time, this remark signals the end of the book of the law in Dt. 30. Since Dt. 4 and 29f.* derive from the same late Deuteronomistic redactors, they are apparently reckoning their own text as part of the *tôrâ*.

The command to place the book that Moses has written next to the ark corresponds to the late Deuteronomistic notion that the ark contains the Decalog that Yahweh wrote on two stone tablets.[60]

Josh. 1:8 associates the imperatives of 1:6, which 1:7 interprets as obedience to the law, with the *sēper.* The author of v. 8 automatically associates the catchword *tôrâ* with the *sēper hattôrâ.* This identification of *tôrâ ʾašer ṣiwwᵉḵā mōšeh* (v. 7) with *sēper* and Deuteronomy is typical of late Deuteronomistic redaction.[61]

The redactor of Josh. 1:8 is also responsible for Josh. 23.[62] He inserted the entire chapter into the text of the Deuteronomistic history as a retrospect from the exilic period back into the time of the conquest with all its opportunities and especially with all its dangers.

c. The text of Josh. 8:30-35 interrupts the narrative of the conquest. In fulfillment of the *sēper tôraṯ mōšeh,* Joshua builds an altar. The context of building an altar suggests that the reference texts here may be Ex. 20:25 and Dt. 27:5-8. Because Josh. 8:32 understands this inscribing of the *mišnēh tôraṯ mōšeh* to be the fulfillment of Dt. 27:2-4, the author of Josh. 8:3-35 must be concerned especially with Dt. 27. The insistence that the commandments of Dt. 27 belong to the *tôraṯ mōšeh* reveals an interest in anchoring Dt. 27 in the *sēper hattôrâ,* a suspicion confirmed by Josh. 8:34, which especially emphasizes that both "blessings and curses" (Dt. 27) are read aloud with the *tôrâ.* This reading of the law in Josh. 8:34 has a parallel in 2 K. 23:3.[63] Assuming that the reading of the law in 2 K. 23, because of its association with the finding of the book, belongs to the *Vorlage* itself,[64] then this passage served as the model for Josh. 8:34f. Indeed, the expression *qᵉhal yiśrāʾēl* (Josh. 8:35) as one typical of exilic ecclesiology even suggests the worship of Ezra (Neh. 8f.) as a parallel and militates for an extremely late dating of Josh. 8:30-35 (possibly ca. 400).[65]

The expression *sēper tôraṯ-mōšeh* in 2 K. 14:6 is especially striking because of the addendum *ʾašer ṣiwwâ YHWH* and the verbatim quotation of Dt. 24:16. This betrays post-Deuteronomistic theology, namely, an understanding of the book of the law of

---

60. Cf. III.4.a.

61. Because of the different intentions evident in this passage, Smend (496f.) ascribes Josh. 1:6 to the Deuteronomistic history, and Josh. 1:7,8 to two successive redactors of the stratum DtrN.

62. Smend, 501-4.

63. Cf. Perlitt, 43.

64. Spieckermann, 74.

65. With H.-J. Fabry, "Noch ein Dekalog," *Im Gespräch mit dem dreieinigen Gott. FS W. Breuning* (Düsseldorf, 1985), 75-96.

Moses as a fixed expression for the entire contents of Deuteronomy. By being traced back to Yahweh's own commandment, it acquires a higher dignity. Deuteronomy is the interpretation of Yahweh's will.[66]

A different emphasis emerges in the Chronicler's account of the finding of the book (2 Ch. 34:14). The book of the law of Moses commanded by Yahweh has now become the book of the law of Yahweh given through Moses. The Chronicler possibly understood the *sēper tôraṯ-YHWH* to be an extensive work (17:9; 34:14), whereas Deuteronomy continued to be designated as the *tôrâ sēper-mōšeh* (25:4; Neh. 13:1). Because 2 Ch. 35:12 refers back to Lev. 3:8-11 and yet speaks about the *sēper mōšeh,* the Chronicler is apparently not differentiating precisely here and understands the *sēper mōšeh* to be the Pentateuch.

Neh. 8f. lends particular emphasis to Yahweh's legislation. Ezra reads the *sēper tôraṯ hā'ᵉlōhîm* (8:18) and the *sēper tôraṯ YHWH* (9:3) in a period of seven days. Despite the necessity for translation and interpretation (8:8), this must have been a relatively extensive work. The dating here as well as citations from Lev. 23:40-42 and 23:33-36 certainly suggests that this was a reading of the Pentateuch. By assuming that Yahweh was the author of this text (cf. 2 Ch. 17:9; 34:14), this passage generates a theology that understands Scripture to be a revelation of the divine will for all subsequent generations.[67]

By using the expression *sēper tôraṯ 'ᵉlōhîm,* Josh. 24:26 alludes to the development of the entire Holy Scriptures as a declaration of the will of God. The course of events parallels that in Deuteronomy (cf. 31:1,9,24; see above). Joshua speaks before the people and then writes down in a book what he has spoken; as in Deuteronomy, this book is called the *sēper hattôrâ.* Josh. 24:26f. is an extremely late addendum provoked by the catchword *bᵉrîṯ.* "The law belongs in the book, and the two together are part of the ברית."[68] The *dᵉḇārîm* refer to the "statutes and ordinances" from Shechem in v. 25b.[69] Like Moses' words, so also are Joshua's words written down and in vv. 26f. canonized as the "words of Yahweh." Indeed, this holy writing even seems to include more than the Pentateuch (Josh. 24:26 includes the Deuteronomistic history).[70]

d. One can observe an intense need in P to insert additional texts as having been transmitted in writing. In Ex. 17:14 R^P has Moses write in a memorial book concerning the battle against the Amalekites.[71] The linguistic and substantive proximity to Dt. 25:19 is striking. The complete annihilation of the Amalekites becomes law, and the recollection of their assault and their defeat, by being written down in a *sēper,* similarly acquires the character of law.

The significance of what is written also becomes clear in Nu. 5:23. Curses written

---

66. Cf. C. Levin, *Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt. FRLANT* 137 (1985), 42f.

67. Cf. B. S. Childs, *Intro. to the OT as Scripture* (Philadelphia, 1979), 648.

68. Perlitt, 269.

69. H. Mölle, *Der sogenannte Landtag zu Sichem. FzB* 42 (1980), 97.

70. Cf. Levin, *Verheissung,* 114ff.

71. Cf. Zenger, *Israel,* 28f., 76f.

on a *sēper* (here probably best translated as "sheet") at a jealousy offering acquire magical power when the sheet is thrown into water. Nu. 11:26 is based on the notion that even the elders chosen as leaders of the people are immediately registered in a list. The predilection for such lists also emerges from the (similarly Priestly) passages Nu. 17:17(2) and 33:2.

Because this terminology is by no means unified, and especially because it does not always involve the word *sēper*, these passages should be viewed merely as examples of this tendency in the P stratum.

5. *Heavenly Books.* The religions of the ancient Orient and of antiquity frequently entertain the notion of "heavenly books."[72] Careful observation allows one to distinguish extremely varied notions here: (1) the book of fate; (2) the book of works; (3) the book of life.[73] The idea of a book of fate originated in Mesopotamia, where "tables of fate" in which the gods have recorded the predetermined lives of human beings are found in many different contexts.[74] Except perhaps for Ps. 139:16, this idea is not found in the OT.[75] Together with the idea of divine judgment,[76] quite varied views concerning heavenly registers of human works are found. This notion resonates in the OT, e.g., in Isa. 65:6 or Dnl. 7:10. It seems to derive from Egyptian traditions and religion, where it is best articulated and whence it also came into other Mediterranean religions.[77]

The final type of heavenly book, the "book of life," is closely associated with the one just discussed, and indeed often cannot be precisely distinguished from it. Influenced by the idea of secular lists of inhabitants, that of similar heavenly lists emerged. These allegedly contain registers of those who will be spared judgment, those who constitute a holy remnant, those predestined for life, etc.[78] This idea, also familiar from Akkadian texts (cf., e.g., the "tablet of life," *lēʾušu ša balāṭe*), occurs in several OT passages, though no direct dependence can be established because both substantive and terminological connections are not evident (cf. Ps. 69:29[28]; Isa. 4:3; Dnl. 12:1; 1 S. 25:29).[79] The late addendum Ex. 32:32f. (R^P) picks up the idea of such a heavenly book and associates it with the theme of the relationship be-

72. → VII, 380.

73. Cf. L. Koep, "Buch IV (himmlisch)," *RAC,* II, 664-731, here 725.

74. Cf. B. Meissner, *BuA,* II, 125.

75. Cf. G. Ravasi, *Il libro dei Salmi III* (Bologna, 1984), 819f.; Koep, "Buch IV (himmlisch)," *RAC,* II, 726; G. Lanczkowski, "Buch/Buchwesen I: religionsgeschichtlich," *TRE,* VII, 270.

76. Cf. K. Seybold, "Gericht Gottes I: AT," *TRE,* XII, 460-66 (with bibliog.); H. Cazelles, "Le jugement des morts en Israël," *Sources Orientales* 4 (1961) 103-42.

77. Cf. H. Brunner, *Grundzüge der altägyptischen Religion* (Darmstadt, 1983), 130ff., 150.

78. Cf. Zenger, "Ps 87,6," esp. 100f.; concerning the association with the stone tablets of Sinai, cf. C. Dohmen, 132-41.

79. See *ABL,* VI, 545, 8. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 168-70; F. Nötscher, *Altorientalischer und alttestamentlicher Auferstehungsglaube* (1926; repr. Darmstadt, 1970), 162f., 315f.

tween the righteous and the unrighteous at God's judgment, a theme of importance during the postexilic period.[80]

This notion of a "book of life" is to be distinguished from that of a "book of remembrance," *sēper zikkārôn,* of the sort mentioned in Mal. 3:16 (see also the addendum in Ps. 56:9[8]).[81] Probably also belonging to the same conceptual horizon, albeit not as heavenly book, are the two late occurrences in Job 19:23 and Ex. 17:14 (R^P).[82]

All this shows that the growing significance of books in various spheres of life resulted in this form of the fixed word also being associated with ideas about heaven or the beyond, as is evident in the various subsequent developments.

6. *"Literature, Letters."* In Dnl. 1:4,17, *sēper* means "writing, type of writing," in the sense of literature or letters. Here *sēper* is used synonymously with the substantive forms of → כתב *kāṯaḇ, kᵉṯāḇ,* and *miḵtāḇ.*

IV. Qumran. Although the noun *sēper* occurs over 20 times in the writings of Qumran, the text of many of the passages is so damaged that it can no longer be read exactly; elsewhere, the context is irretrievable. 1QS 6:7; 7:1,2 refer perhaps to the community's own writings with abs. *sēper.* Similarly, *[s]pr srk* in 1QM 15:5 may also refer to a community writing. In references to the OT, it is noteworthy that the expression *spr htwrh* occurs but once (CD 5:2). The *spry htwrh* (CD 7:15) is mentioned once parallel to the *spry hnby'ym* (CD 7:17); the former is an expression not found in the OT itself, which consistently speaks about only *one* torah (cf. the discussion of *sēper hattôrâ*). The expression derives from the lengthy controversy concerning whether the Pentateuch is to be written on a single, continuous scroll or on five individual scrolls.[83] OT books are, however, also directly mentioned, e.g., the *spr yšʿyh* (4QFlor 1:15), or the *spr yḥzqʾl* (4QFlor 1:16).

The variously mentioned *spr hhgw* (CD 10:6; 13:2; 14:7[?]; 1QSa 1:7) might first be construed as "Book of Meditation" (from *hgh* I, "read, contemplate, recite").[84] Various identities have been suggested: 1QS, 1QH, the halakah, the Torah, or a collection of specific community regulations.[85] M. Goshen-Gottstein speaks of a *sēper hāhegeh,* "Book of Sighs" (cf. Ezk. 2:10).[86] The suggestion "Book of Purifications" is probably off the mark (i.e., *hgw* = secret code for *ṣrp* [reversal of the alphabet]).[87]

Based on substantive considerations, one might also consider the OT book of Haggai. This would also explain the frequent mention of this particular book in the

80. Cf. Dohmen, 118ff.
81. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 527.
82. Cf. A. Weiser, *Das Buch Hiob. ATD* 13 (1951, ⁷1980), 147ff.; Zenger, *Israel,* 76ff.
83. Cf. St.-B., IV/1, 133f.
84. *HAL,* I, 238. Cf. J. Maier, *Die Texte vom Toten Meer,* II (1960), 55.
85. For 1QS see Dupont-Sommer; for 1QH, see Bardtke; for the halakah see Rabin; Ginzberg; Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law* (Leiden, 1977), 16 and n. 13; for the Torah, Licht; Schiffman, *The Halakha at Qumran* (Leiden, 1975), 53; for the regulations, Maier.
86. "'Sefer Hagu' — The End of a Puzzle," *VT* 8 (1958) 286ff.
87. Contra J. Schonfield, *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York, 1957), 2ff.

community of Qumran, particularly with the expectation inspired by this book of a double (priestly and royal) Messiah (cf. 1QS 9:11),[88] especially considering that in context the texts mentioned above do reflect this problem.

CD 16:3 also mentions a *spr mḥlqwt h'tym* ("Book of the Divisions of the Times"); scholars have frequently suspected that this refers to the book of Jubilees, one quite familiar in Qumran.

The quotation of Mal. 3:16 in CD 20:19 introduces yet another occurrence of a *spr zkrwn,* suggesting both here and perhaps also with regard to the *spr šmwt* mentioned in 1QM 12:2 the notion of the "heavenly books."[89] The noun *spr,* "book," occurs only twice in 11QT (56:4,21) in citations from Dt. 17.

Hossfeld — Reuter

---

88. Cf. Koch, *Prophets,* II, 163f.; K. Schubert, "Die Messiaslehre in den Texten von Chirbet Qumran," *BZ* 1 (1957) 177-97.

89. Cf. Nötscher; Koep; see III.4.c above.

סָקַל *sāqal*

Contents: I. The Root *sql.* II. OT and Mishnah. III. Summary. IV. LXX.

I. The Root *sql.* The root *sql* is attested only in Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic (which borrowed it from Hebrew). This root refers to a customary method of execution, and its absence in other Semitic languages derives from the absence of stoning in Mesopotamia, Syria, and Asia Minor. By contrast, the semantically related → רגם *rāḡam* has parallels in both Arabic and Ethiopic.

II. OT and Mishnah. The verb is used formulaically in the qal and niphal to refer to a specific method of punishment. Though one cannot determine how far back this particular use of the root goes, the OT does also attest a nontechnical use (cf. the piel).

---

sāqal. A. Alt, "The Origins of Israelite Law," *Essays on OT History and Religion* (Eng. trans., Oxford, 1966), 79-132, here 114; H. J. Boecker, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT. WMANT* 14 (^{2}1970), 148f.; Clemen, *Islamica* 10, 170ff.; D. Daube, *Studies in Biblical Law* (Cambridge, 1947; repr. New York, 1969); J. Gabriel, "Die Todesstrafe im Lichte des ATs," *Theologische Studien der Gegenwart. FS T. Innitzer* (Vienna, 1952), 69-79; R. Hirzel, *Die Strafe der Steinigung* (1909); G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. WMANT* 39 (1971), esp. 49f.; H. Schüngel-Straumann, "Tod und Leben in der Gesetzesliteratur des Pentateuch" (diss., Bonn, 1969), esp. 131ff.; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 158-60.

Two semantic groups are evident here, one that may be old, and one that was used during the exilic-postexilic period. The first can be found in the account of Shimei and his relationship with David. Shimei allegedly "threw stones at David and at all the servants of King David" (2 S. 16:6; piel with acc. of person; cf. v. 13 without an object). Shimei threw stones in order to revile David, perhaps also to injure him, though this is not an execution unless Shimei intends to evoke one symbolically.

Another use of the root can be found in two passages from different periods. In the Song of the Unfruitful Vineyard in Isa. 5, we read: "My beloved had a vineyard on a very fertile hill. He dug it and cleared it of stones *(way^e saqq^e lēhû),* and planted it with choice vines" (vv. 1b-2a). This "clearing of stones" means to "throw those stones away" that were dug out of the field; i.e., here, too, the root involves throwing stones. The much later text Isa. 62:10 also reflects this usage: "Build up, build up the highway, clear it of stones" *(saqq^e lû mē'eḇen).* This use, however, attested only in the piel, is not the usual one.

As a rule, the root is used to designate a certain means of punishment. "If we offer in the sight of the Egyptians sacrifices that are offensive to them, will they not stone us? *(w^e lō' yisq^e lunû)*" (Ex. 8:22[Eng. v. 26]). Moses fears stoning will be precipitated as an emotional reaction. "So Moses cried out to Yahweh, 'What shall I do with this people? They are almost ready to stone me'" (17:4). The Book of the Covenant also prescribes stoning as punishment for oxen, which in certain cases is not entirely incomprehensible. "When an ox gores a man or a woman to death, the ox shall be stoned" (21:28). If its owner has been warned, "the ox shall be stoned, and its owner also shall be put to death" (v. 29). Similarly, "if the ox gores a male or female slave, the owner shall pay to the slave owner thirty shekels of silver, and the ox shall be stoned" (21:32). These laws are stricter than the parallels in the Code of Hammurabi, which stipulates that the owner must pay only if he was previously warned, but otherwise incurs no guilt, and which says nothing about killing the animal.[1]

Whereas most of the previously cited occurrences in Exodus derive from daily life and represent laws for conceivable cases, the situation in Ex. 19 is different. "You shall set limits for the people all around, saying, 'Be careful not to go up the mountain or to touch the edge of it. Any who touch the mountain shall be put to death. No hand shall touch them, but they shall be stoned or shot with arrows; whether animal or human being, they shall not live" (19:12f.). It was the holiness of the mountain itself that made the people or animals who touched it so dangerous that no other person was permitted to touch them. This in its own turn necessitated a manner of execution not requiring contact.

Deuteronomy clearly views stoning as the most stringent punishment for the most abominable transgressions. A direct accusation sufficed for the death penalty in the case of someone worshiping foreign gods or beings of any kind. "Stone them to death for trying to turn you away from Yahweh your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery" (Dt. 13:11[10]). Dt. 17 recommends a thorough in-

1. CH, §§250-52; *ANET,* 16.

vestigation; after hearing two or three witnesses, "then you shall bring out to your gates that man or that woman who has committed this crime and you shall stone the man or woman to death" (17:5).

In addition to apostasy from Yahweh, other transgressions also required stoning: those of a sexual nature. If a man takes a wife and finds no sign of virginity in the young woman, "then they shall bring the young woman out to the entrance of her father's house and the men of her town shall stone her to death, because she committed a disgraceful act in Israel by prostituting herself in her father's house. So you shall purge the evil from your midst" (Dt. 22:21). The situation is different "if there is a young woman, a virgin already engaged to be married, and a man meets her in the town and lies with her, you shall bring both of them to the gate of that town and stone them to death, the young woman because she did not cry for help in the town and the man because he violated his neighbor's wife. So you shall purge the evil from your midst. But if the man meets the engaged woman in the open country, and the man seizes her and lies with her, then only the man who lay with her shall die" (22:23-25). Although in the last case the root *sql* is not used, the preceding verse suggests that the death penalty was also carried out here through stoning.

Whereas in these cases stoning involves civil law, in the case of Achan (Josh. 7) it exhibits sacral features. The Judean Achan violated the devoted things, was found out through oracular lots, and stoned: "And all Israel stoned him to death; they burned all that was his with fire" (7:25). Disappointment and rage, however, could also be expressed in such stonings. When the Amalekites burn Ziklag and carry off the women and children, the people speak of stoning David because he was not able to help them (1 S. 30:6).

1 K. 21 addresses the misuse of stoning. The property owner Naboth the Jezreelite refused to surrender his vineyard near the royal palace to King Ahab. The queen has him falsely accused of having cursed God and the king, and demands he be stoned (1 K. 21:10). This execution by stoning, which indeed is carried out (v. 13; further occurrences of the verb in vv. 14,15), was used here because Naboth's alleged crime, blaspheming God and king, was so serious. Stoning as punishment for blaspheming God and king has clearly become an institution here, just as was later the case.

Mishnaic Hebrew uses the verb in the same way as Biblical Hebrew: "to stone" (qal), "be stoned" (niphal), and "remove stones" (piel). "And they condemned him to stoning" (*ûsᵉqālûhû; Sanh.* 6.1; Bab. *Sanh.* 46a); "they take him forth to stone him" (Bab. *Sanh.* 42b: *lᵉsoqlô*). Tosephta *Šabb.* 6(7).5 attests that punishment by stoning could also be employed to excess: "If one says: stone *(siqlû)* this cock, for it crows in the evening, this is a superstitious act."

The same meaning, except in the passive sense, uses the niphal. "He is led forth to be stoned *(lissāqēl)*" (Mishnah *Sanh.* 6.1). "A man is stoned naked, but a woman is not stoned naked" (6.3). "All that have been stoned *(hannisqālîn)* must be hanged" (6.4). "The stone with which he was stoned *(šennisqēl)*" (Bab. *Sanh.* 43a). As in Ex. 21:28, an ox could also be stoned; "the ox to be stoned *(hannisqāl)* because it killed a person."

According to Mishnah *Sanh.* 1.4, however, this case could be examined by twenty-three judges.

As in the OT, the verb in the piel means "remove stones": "until the New Year, they may clear away the stones from the field" (e.g., *Šeb.* 2.3). Tosephta *B. Qam.* 2.12 makes clear that one may not remove stones from a field in order to lay them on the road. Whoever removes stones must also carry them away. Nor may anyone remove stones from someone else's fields for personal use (2.13).

III. Summary. Because the word → רגם *rgm* occurs parallel with *sql* with the same meaning, no complete overview of the phenomenon "stoning" can be given using just the root *sql.* The original meaning of the root *sql* seems to be "throw stones," expanded later to "throw stones in order to kill." The reference was to an immediate reaction in order to counter an enemy, to punish a person or animal, or to express one's own rage. The last can be found, e.g., in Ex. 8:22(26); 17:4; 2 S. 16:6,13. This is not what one might call lynch-mob justice, but rather an emotional reaction.

The root *sql* preserved its technical meaning in both Deuteronomic and Deuteronomistic writing: "stoning as punishment for serious offenses," including blasphemy, touching the holy mount, worshiping foreign gods, sexual transgressions, or crimes of a sacral nature. The punishment could occasionally also be used against animals.

IV. LXX. The LXX generally renders *sql* with *lithoboléō,* "to stone." In the account of Shimei in 2 S. 16:6,13, however, the LXX uses *litházō,* as does the NT in several instances (e.g., Jn. 8:5; 10:31ff.). In three instances the LXX uses *katalitházō* (Ex. 17:4, *sql;* Nu. 14:10, *rgm;* Lk. 20:6).

Kapelrud

סָרִיס *sārîs*

Contents: I. 1. Semantic Ambivalence; Etymology; 2. Translations; 3. Eunuchs in the Ancient Orient. II. 1. OT; 2. Theological Considerations.

---

sārîs. T. K. Cheyne, "Eunuch," *EncBib,* 1427; T. L. Fenton, *"sārîs," EMiqr,* V (1963), 1126f.; J. G. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* (London, 1907), esp. 221-37; L. H. Gray and T. W. Juynboll, "Eunuch," *ERE,* V, 579-85; M. Heltzer, "On the Akkadian Term *rēšu* in Ugarit," *Israel Oriental Studies* 4 (1974), 4-11; A. Hug, "Eunuchen," *PWSup,* III, 449-55; W. T. in der Smitten, "Der Tirschātā' in Esra-Nehemia," *VT* 21 (1971) 618-20; G. E. Kadish, "Eunuchs in Ancient Egypt?" *Studies in Honor of John A. Wilson. SAOC* 35 (1969), 55-67; K. A. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and OT* (Chicago, 1966), 165f.; E. Neufeld, *Ancient Hebrew Marriage Laws* (London, 1944), esp. 220-23; A. D. Nock, "Eunuchs in Ancient Religion," *ARW* 23 (1925) 25-33; U. Rüterswörden, *Die Beamten der israelitischen Königszeit. BWANT* 117 (1985); J. Schneider, "εὐνοῦχος," *TDNT,* II, 765-68; E. Sehmsdorf, "Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte von Jesaja 56–66," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 517-76, esp. 556-58; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 121, 225; J. Vergote, *Joseph en*

I. 1. *Semantic Ambivalence; Etymology.* Two socially contrasting classes are indicated by the term *sārîs.* The first includes distinguished officials at the royal court (1 Ch. 28:1), the second the group of castrates excluded from the community at large (Isa. 56:3). Because neither two separate etymologies nor a semantic change in one or the other direction can be persuasively demonstrated, one cannot determine whether this semantic ambivalence involves genuine homonymy on the one hand, or polysemy on the other prompted by extremely divergent semantic development.

Some scholars postulate a root *srs,* "to castrate," and its derivative *sārîs,* "eunuch," distinguishing this from the loanword *sārîs,* "court official," associating it thereby with *šrš* piel, "uproot, destroy," with *nsr,* "saw off, plane off," and the resultant reduplication *srsr* (Arab. *šršr,* "cut off").[1] Others view it as a *šap̱ʿēl* construction of *rss,* "crush." None of these precarious suggestions has found much acceptance, however, and recent consensus generally tends to view the Middle Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, and Arabic verbal forms with the meaning "to castrate" or "be impotent" as denominative derivatives of *sārîs* (Paleo-Aram. and Egyp. Aram. *srs,* Jewish Aram. and Syr. *srysʾ,* Arab. *sarîs*),[2] itself allegedly a derivative of Akk. *ša rēši* (pl. *šūt rēši*). Yet as transparent as the Akkadian construction is (*ša rēši* means lit. "he of the head"), just as unclear does its original meaning remain, nor is its later use any more comprehensible.[3] The Akkadian word may originally have referred to a person who stood at the top, a "chief" (the Sumerian ideogram in Middle Assyrian as well as in Akkadian texts from Ugarit is SAG, "head");[4] or it referred to the one whose place was at the king's head, i.e., to his personal servant. This latter suggestion might be supported by the apparently more complete expression *ša rēš šarri* (*šarru,* "king"; cf. Heb. *rōʾê pᵉnê hammeleḵ,* "the king's counselors," Jer. 52:25). This is not attested with any frequency, however, and could also be countered by the expression *ša rēši ekallim* (*ekallu,* "palace"), referring to the palace steward. The expression *ša rēš šarri* accordingly might refer simply to "the royal *ša rēši.*"

In any event, the Akkadian word represents the title of a high court official. In no small number of documents, however, these *šut rēši* are juxtaposed with the *šut ziqni,* the "bearded ones," and must accordingly refer to those who are beardless, i.e., to those who have been emasculated. This is also suggested by the expression *ana ša rēšēn taʾʾuru,* "make into a *ša rēši,*" i.e., "castrate," and by the curse directed at an enemy that his descendants might wither and die as with the infertile *šut rēši.*[5] Finally, *rēšu* alone

---

Egypte (Leuven, 1959), esp. 40-42; E. Weidner, "Hof- und Harems-Erlasse assyrischer Könige aus dem 2. Jahrtausend v.Chr.," *AfO* 17 (1956) 257-93; E. M. Yamauchi, "Was Nehemiah the Cupbearer a Eunuch?" *ZAW* 92 (1980) 132-42.

1. See E. Ben Yehuda, *Thesaurus Totius Hebraitatis,* 8 vols. (repr. New York, 1960), V, 4217f., 4223f.; Cheyne; *GesTh,* 973; J. Fürst, *Hebräisches und Chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das AT,* ed. V. Ryssel (Leipzig, [3]1876), 97f.
2. See *HAL,* II, 764.
3. *AHw,* II, 974.
4. Cf. H. Zimmern, *ZDMG* 53 (1899) 116.
5. See Fenton.

can also be used elliptically to mean "eunuch."[6] Although this terminological connection between "courtier" and "castrate" is attested for the late 2nd millennium B.C. in documents of the Middle Assyrian kingdom,[7] it does not seem to have been the case originally or to have been valid for all linguistic periods. Hence one may also assume a semantic narrowing, one attested elsewhere as well, from "court official" to "eunuch," in which the earlier general meaning, however, seems occasionally to have been preserved as well.[8]

With this semantic ambivalence and by way of Middle Assyrian, in which *š* became *s*, the term *ša rēši* became Heb. *sārîs*. The Hebrew form is thus not to be viewed as a genuine *qaṭṭîl* construction,[9] something also suggested by the fluctuating linguistic evidence. That is, the pl. is *sārîsîm*, the const. sg. *s^e^rîs*, const. pl. *s^e^rîsê* alongside *sārîsê*.[10]

2. *Translations.* The LXX usually translates with *eunoúchos* (31 times), and only twice with *spádōn* (Gen. 37:36; Isa. 39:7, though the parallel in 2 K. 20:18 attests the standard translation). The latter word doubtless means "castrate," and although *eunoúchos* also has this as its normal meaning, its traditional etymology *eunḗ* + *échō*, "bedkeeper,"[11] does allow for more possibilities. In the accounts of Ctesias of Cnidos, this word also refers to the "bedside companion," i.e., to the close friend of the young Persian lord.[12] This might account for its undifferentiated use. Nor does the single instance where *sārîs* seems to be explicated semantically in being translated by *dynástēs*, "ruler" (Jer. 34:19), prove this equivalence. The Greek word might reflect the term *śārê*,[2] "princes," from the Hebrew text, a word the LXX seems to omit. Although important mss. (Vaticanus, Sinaiticus) have *eunoúchos* in Neh. 1:11 as well, the better reading is *oinochóos* for *mašqeh*, "cupbearer." The office of cupbearer was not necessarily occupied by eunuchs.[13] The Vulg. blindly follows the Greek translation with *eunuchus*.

By contrast, the Targs. clarify this semantic ambiguity, albeit without any discernible criteria, reading *gwz'* (also *srys*), "castrate" (e.g., 2 K. 8:6), over against *rbrb'* (also *rb, šlyṭ, gbr*), "prince" (Jer. 41:16). The Jewish tradition at large tends to emphasize the word's semantic ambiguity (Bab. *Sanh.* 93b; Ibn Ezra on Dnl. 1:3; Kimchi on 2 K. 10:18, etc.).

3. *Eunuchs in the Ancient Orient.* Eunuchs in the broad sense are men who are inca-

---

6. See Heltzer.
7. See Weidner.
8. See Kitchen.
9. Contra Ben Yehuda, *Thesaurus*, V, 4217f., 4223f.
10. *BLe*, §68h.
11. A different view is taken by P. Jensen, "Sumero-akkadische und babylonische Götternamen," *ZA* 1 (1886) 20.
12. F. W. König, "Die Persika des Ktesias von Knidos," *BAfO* 18 (1972), 33.
13. Yamauchi.

pable of procreation as a result of a developmental defect or as a result of damage to the testicles from accident or from a surgical operation (Mt. 19:12; Mishnah *Yebam.* 8.4). In the narrower sense, this refers to the voluntary castration of males, a phenomenon with cultural-historical as well as sociological implications.

Society viewed the condition of eunuchs the same way it did other physical anomalies: as a sign of inferiority and as a disgrace. It considered eunuchs to be both lustful (since sexual desire, even if diminished or altered, did not necessarily disappear entirely)[14] and underhanded. They were mocked and officially shunned.[15] Castration served as a form of punishment or was an imposed disgrace. Prisoners of war and slaves were castrated.[16] According to Middle Assyrian law any man who committed adultery, engaged in malicious slander toward someone's wife, or engaged in homosexual acts was also castrated.[17]

Nonetheless, eunuchs gradually came to be valued. The castrated slave, who could establish no family of his own and had to accommodate himself to living as an alien, was utterly dependent on his master as well as devoted and dependable.[18] Eunuchs were suitable as overseers in harems and often became confidants of the ruler. As such, at different times and in different countries they did indeed acquire political influence, as they did among the Persian Achaemenids, at the Chinese emperor's court, under some Roman emperors, in the Byzantine Empire, and in the Eastern church. Mesopotamian rulers obligated highly placed eunuchs through real estate grants; when the owner died, he had no heirs, and his possessions reverted back to the crown. Egyptian documents almost never mention eunuchs, though eunuchs can be discerned on some grave reliefs as companions to women.[19]

Emasculation as a religious act deserves mention, especially as practiced in certain religions in Asia Minor. Myths tell of gods who castrate themselves (Eshmun, Attis), and some cults include eunuchs as priests (the Γάλλοι, the priests in the Ephesian Artemisium). Though the motives for such self-mutilation are not entirely transparent, it seems to be the exaggerated expression of ideas deriving from nature myths (the dying of nature; fertility rites) as well as of the inclination to engage in ascetic self-torment. The OT rejects any self-mutilation within cultic ecstasy (1 K. 18:28), and nowhere mentions religious emasculation, not even in connection with foreign cults (unless Dt. 23:2[Eng. v. 1] is referring to such).

II. 1. *OT.* OT use of the word *sārîs* is intimately connected with terminology associated with royal court titles. Only one text refers to the condition of a eunuch as a merely physical phenomenon (Isa. 56:3f.). Significantly, not a single passage in which *sārîs* refers to a court official allows us to demonstrate persuasively that the

14. Cf. Sir. 30:20; Jerome *Ep.* 107.11.
15. Terence *Eunuchus* 357; Gray.
16. Herodotus *Hist.* 6.32.
17. *ANET,* 181.
18. Herodotus *Hist.* 8.105; Xenophon *Cyr.* 8.5.60ff.
19. Vergote.

person so titled was not a castrate. Similarly, no passage mentions that a particular *sārîs* was married (cf. Gen. 37:36) nor that another was a military commander (cf. 2 K. 25:19). Older sources report that eunuchs did have wives or were army or navy commanders. Nonetheless, the assumption that several biblical verses use the word to refer to nothing more than a court title and are not referring to a castrate has enjoyed the justified assent of most lexicographers and commentators. This assumption is supported primarily by the fact that, apart from the word *sārîs* itself, no OT writings ever mention eunuchs of a primarily political nature. Neither the law nor historical writings nor prophecy nor wisdom writings mention the castration of a courtier, his impotence, or his childlessness. Nor does the language attest any verb meaning "make into a *sārîs*." But later accounts of much earlier events are sometimes inclined to add the word to enumerations of courtiers in situations when the members of a particular royal court need to include highly placed persons with titles; i.e., these are not situations when castrates necessarily need to be mentioned (Gen. 40:2; 1 S. 8:15; 1 Ch. 28:1). Authors were thus already familiar with the word (probably since the time of Assyrian influence in Judah and Israel) as a simple title, though this obviously does not exclude the possibility that some of these courtiers may in fact have been eunuchs, especially those who may have been non-Israelites or harem supervisors. The task is then to examine each context to determine the particular meaning more precisely, i.e., "castrate," "court eunuch," or "courtier."

Isa. 56:3f. speaks of a Jewish castrate as such, regardless of which social stratum is involved. Because he will have no descendants, this particular *sārîs* views himself as a withered tree. The *sārîs* mentioned in the book of Esther will probably always evoke genuine eunuchs, as seems self-evident regarding the harem overseers (Est. 2:3,14,15), the emissaries dispatched to the women's quarters (1:10ff.), and the personal attendants of the queen (4:4). The author, who seems to be quite familiar with the Persian court,[20] also classifies other courtiers of this designation (7:8; cf. the name with 1:10) in the same category, including the conspirators among the bodyguards (2:21).

The threatening oracle to Hezekiah predicts that his sons will one day be *sārîsîm* in the palace of the king of Babylon (Isa. 39:7 = 2 K. 20:18), and is probably to be taken literally. Understanding the word here in the sense of "chamberlain" amounts to transforming a terrible punishment virtually into a privilege.[21] The talmudic tradition attests both interpretations (Bab. *Sanh.* 93b). Opponents of the literal understanding are offended because this forces the conclusion that Daniel and his companions, in whom the prophecies were fulfilled (Dnl. 1:3ff.), were actually eunuchs.[22] This, they argue, is contradicted by the following verse, which states they were "young men without physical defect." As a matter of fact, the young Judeans were given over to the tutelage of the *raḇ sārîsîm* (v. 3, the equivalent of the *śar hassārîsîm* in v. 7; LXX *archieunoúchos*).

---

20. Herodotus *Hist.* 3.92; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* ([2]1937; repr. Darmstadt, 1980), III, 41.

21. Cf. the translations of T, Luther, Buber-Rosenzweig.

22. So the later Karaite commentator Japheth ben Eli (10th century); cf. Ibn Ezra, in loc.

The author of this work, writing a considerable time after the exile, probably inserted a title that to him seemed appropriate for the Neo-Babylonian Empire. It must remain open whether he thought this was a "chief eunuch" or a "palace master" (so NRSV); what is certain is that he by no means intended to portray the young Judeans as eunuchs. The title resembles that of the *raḇ-sārîs* borne by one of the Babylonian commanders (Jer. 39:3,13; 2 Kgs. 18:17, which attaches the title to an Assyrian, is probably a gloss; cf. Isa. 36:2). This corresponds to the *rbsrs* on an Akkadian-Aramaic inscription from Nineveh, the official designation of a highly placed person, and resembles the seal impression *mrsrsy Sargon,* "chief of the *sārîsîm* of Sargon." Even if the office and its functions are no longer known to us in their specifics, it is nonetheless clear that this is referring to a high military or diplomatic functionary rather than to a chief eunuch.

The persons called *sārîs* at the Judean and Israelite courts were probably castrated courtiers (Ebed-melech in Jer. 38:7; Nathan-melech in 2 K. 23:11). This is suggested in the first instance by the person's foreign nationality as well as by the apposition *'îš sārîs* (though cf. Ex. 2:14; Jgs. 6:8, etc.), and in the second instance by the name with the same theophoric element and the determination *hassārîs.*

The refugees who survived the massacre at Mizpah included men, women, children, and *sārîsîm* (Jer. 41:16).[23] The sequence and classification within this enumeration suggest that the latter were eunuchs who previously had served at the Babylonian garrison.

The *sārîsîm* identified as Jezebel's personal servants when the rebels arrive were castrated harem overseers (2 K. 9:32), as were those who accompanied the king's mother and wives into exile (2 K. 24:15; Jer. 29:2). Otherwise, however, e.g., also in Jer. 34:19, the word refers simply to courtiers.

This is especially obvious in the anachronistic mention of *sārîsîm* in accounts of the time of Samuel or of Saul and David (1 S. 8:15; 1 Ch. 28:1), accounts seeking to embellish the old royal court a bit more lavishly. The *sārîs* who is familiar both with the political situation and with the atmosphere at the court and is sent on an important mission to the prophet Micaiah son of Imlah (1 K. 22:9) probably belongs to the upper level court personnel, as does the *sārîs* who with royal authority reestablishes an old right of possession (2 K. 8:6). The *sārîs* placed in command of the soldiers (2 K. 25:19 = Jer. 52:25) is also a high functionary rather than a eunuch.

Similarly, only the background and experiences of the author himself rather than circumstances at the Egyptian court can answer the question concerning the *sārîsîm* in the Joseph narrative (Gen. 37:36; 40:2,7). Despite the considerable Egyptian coloring of the story in the larger sense, the forms of address and titles actually reflect Assyrian-Babylonian circumstances (cf. Gen. 37:36, *śar haṭṭabbāḥîm;* 2 K. 25:8, *raḇ haṭṭabbāḥîm*), which were familiar in Israel. The narrative is interested in introducing high titles, not in reporting about the presence of eunuchs.

2. *Theological Considerations.* As among other nations, ancient Israel, too, considered only the unblemished body to be cultically pure. Sacrificial animals had to be

23. Concerning textual questions here, see *BHS.*

without blemish, and castrated animals were expressly forbidden as such (Lev. 21:20; 22:24). Because the organ of procreation was accorded special significance, it was also surrounded by protective taboos.[24] A man "whose testicles are crushed or whose penis is cut off shall not be admitted to the assembly of Yahweh" (Dt. 23:2[1], *pᵉṣûaʿ dakkāʾ*. . . *kᵉrûṯ šopkâ*). Although the word *sārîs* is not used here, the Vulg. translates with the explication, "non intrabit *eunuchus* adtritis vel amputatis testiculis et absciso veretro ecclesiam domini." Since accidental injury of this sort was probably not so frequent that the law would have to accord it special attention, this stipulation presumably is directed at least in part against cultic self-mutilation.

During the Babylonian exile, the question of eunuchs confronted the Jews as a problem cast in a quantitatively and qualitatively new dimension. Probably not a few of the Jews became the victims of this bloody custom. But the spiritualization of their religious understanding in the larger sense made it possible to look beyond physical externalities and to arrive at an estimation of human beings that took into account a person's essence and disposition. Thus does the prophet of the exile announce that the eunuch who keeps the sabbath, chooses the things that please Yahweh, and holds fast to Yahweh's covenant will not be cut off from the people of Yahweh; rather, "I will give [to that eunuch], in my house and within my walls, a monument and a name better than sons and daughters" (Isa. 56:3-5). Finally, the wise person teaches that the eunuch who is upright in both deed and intentions will be blessed and will have "a place of great delight in the temple of Yahweh" (Wis. 3:14).

Kedar-Kopfstein

---

24. Cf. Dt. 25:11 with the Middle Assyrian Laws, §8, *ANET,* 181.

סרן *srn*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology, Meaning; 2. LXX. II. Secular Use. III. Religio-Cultic Associations.

---

srn. F. Bork, "Philistäische Namen und Vokabeln," *AfO* 13 (1939-41) 226-30; M. Ellenbogen, *Foreign Words in the OT* (London, 1962), 126f.; V. Georgiev, "Sur l'origine et la langue des Pélasges, des Philistins, des Danaens et des Achéens," *Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschung* 1 (1950) 136-41; W. Helck, "Ein sprachliches Indiz für die Herkunft der Philister," *BN* 21 (1983) 31; A. Ḥ. Jones, *Bronze Age Civilization: The Philistines and the Danites* (Washington, D.C., 1975), 130, 154; K. A. Kitchen, "The Philistines," *Peoples of OT Times,* ed. D. J. Wiseman (Oxford, 1973), 53-78; G. A. Lehmann, "Die 'Seevölker'-Herrschaften an der Levanteküste," *Jahresbericht des Instituts für Vorgeschichte der Universität Frankfurt/Main*

I. 1. *Etymology, Meaning.* The root *srn* occurs in the OT only as a noun (22 times, plus once in Sirach), with only pl. forms attested (whence the sg. **seren* is postulated). Beyond Hebrew, the root also occurs in Ugaritic as well as in Jewish Aramaic and Syriac texts.[1] One must, however, distinguish between the two meanings "axle" and "ruler, prince." Whereas Ugaritic attests the root (as noun and verb) only with the meaning "axle" and "lord, prince,"[2] the meaning "axle" also occurs in both Jewish Aramaic and Syriac. As such, the personal designation "ruler" would have to be viewed as the earlier and original one from which the technical meaning "axle" emerged only secondarily through transference of this basic meaning to the material realm; i.e., an axle keeps two wheels together and to that extent rules, leads, and governs them.

Because OT use of the root with the meaning "ruler, prince," refers exclusively to the rulers of the Philistines,[3] the noun *s^erānîm* has repeatedly been taken to be a genuinely Philistine word that the Israelites acquired as a loanword. In this context scholars understood it as being of Indo-European origin, deriving it then from the West Anatolian/Aegean sphere by associating it with the Hittite title *kuriwana* (= *tarwana*) or with Gk. *týrannos* (deriving probably from Lydian).[4] Others suggested some connection with the linguistic sphere of the Caucasus.[5] Still others adduce the word *ser,* "up," from Asia Minor,[6] though the *n* as suffix does present problems here. G. Garbini has pointed out that *n* frequently occurs as the conclusion to Phrygian or Lycian rulers' designations.[7] Finally, I. Eitan refers to Egyp. *śrn(.t),* "high officer of a city."[8]

(1976), 78-111 = (Munich, 1977), 36-56; T. C. Mitchell, "Philistia," *Archaeology and OT Study,* ed. D. Winton Thomas (Oxford, 1967), 405-27; F. Perles, "סרנים *šarrânim,*" *OLZ* 8 (1905) 179-80; F. Pintore, "Seren, tarwanis, tyrannos," O. Carruba et al., *Studi orientali in ricordo di Franco Pintore* (Pavia, 1983), 285-322; A. Strobel, *Der spätbronzezeitliche Seevölkersturm. BZAW* 145 (1976), 262f.; H. Tiktin, *Kritische Untersuchungen zu den Büchern Samuelis. FRLANT* 16 (1922), 10; G. A. Wainwright, "Some Early Philistine History," *VT* 9 (1959) 73-84.

1. *WUS,* no. 1952; *UT,* no. 1797; *HAL,* II, 770.
2. Cf. J. C. de Moor, "Rāpi'ūma — Rephaim," *ZAW* 88 (1976) 332 n. 68.
3. Cf. II.2 below.
4. For the Hittite see Kitchen, 67; Mitchell, 413; Strobel, 262f. The first to suggest the Greek was A. Klostermann, *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige. Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testamentes,* part 3 (Nördlingen, 1887), 17; cf. E. C. B. MacLaurin, "Anak/ἈΝΑΞ," *VT* 15 (1965) 472ff.
5. Bork, 228, 230.
6. Cf. E. Laroche, "Comparaison du Louvite et du Lycien," *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 53/1 (1957f.) 178; G. Garbini, "יאב (Ps 119,131); תאב (Amos 6,8s): אבה 'volere,'" *Richerche linguistiche* 5 (1962) 178f.; R. Gusmani, "סְרָנִים," *Annali del'Instituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli. Pubblicazioni Sezione linguistica* 4 (1962), 45ff.; A. Heubeck, "Idg. *sĕr-*'oben,'" *Orbis Christianus* 13 (1964) 264ff.
7. "Elementi 'egei' nella cultura siro-palestinese," *Atti Congr. Int. di Micenologia,* 1/2 (1967), 73 n. 32.
8. "Les 'Princes des Philistins' et l'étymologie de סרני פלשתים," *REJ* 82 (1926) 223; cf. Ellenbogen.

In view of the Ugaritic witnesses for this root, however, all these hypotheses are probably incorrect.[9] The word *s^erānîm* is of Semitic origin, corresponding structurally to Heb. *melek*, pl. *m^elāḵîm.*

2. *LXX.* The LXX translates *s^erānîm* in the meaning "ruler" largely as *satrápai,* though in Jgs. 16, Codex B uses *árchontes* instead, which also occurs in 1 S. 6:4 and Sir. 46:18, while 1 Ch. 12:20(Eng. v. 19) translates as *stratēgoí.* The LXX uses *tá proséchonta* to translate the noun in the meaning "axle."

II. Secular Use.

1. *Technical.* The OT uses this root only once with reference to an object of the material world. In 1 K. 7:30 it refers to the bronze axles on the "basin wagons" in the Solomonic temple; these wagons served as the chassis for large water basins, but were in fact only rarely moved.[10] We can no longer determine whether the axles of chariots, transport wagons, or other covered wagons drawn by horses were also called *s^erānîm.*[11]

2. *Persons.* As a reference to persons with the meaning "ruler, prince," the OT uses the noun *s^erānîm* 22 times (including Sirach), though only in reference to the rulers of the five Philistine city states[12] and temporally restricted to the time extending to the end of the reign of King Saul. Afterward, the rulers of the Philistines are consistently called "kings," as indicated in 1 K. 2:39; Jer. 25:20; Zech. 9:5, as well as in the Assyrian and Babylonian royal inscriptions beginning with Sargon II.[13] Because the title of king was also used in reference to the Philistine ruler Achish of Gath (1 S. 21:11,13[10,12]; 27:2) even before the end of Saul's reign, however, the apparent break in the use of the designation *s^erānîm* cannot really be explained as a result of an altered political situation that obtained beginning with the reign of King David.[14] This designation, which is clearly distinguished from *śārîm* (cf. 1 S. 29:2-9),[15] probably refers instead to a general designation the Philistines themselves commonly used during their early period to refer to their rulers, one that did not, however, exclude the title "king."

The function of ruler or the status of king was hereditary (cf. 1 S. 27:2; 1 K. 2:39 for Gath; and Esarhaddon's prism for Ashdod and Ashkelon).[16] No clearly discernible superior ranking is evident within the circle of the *s^erānîm,* neither for a specific ruler nor for a city. The individual rulers apparently constituted a consortium of equal regents (cf. 1 S. 6:1-12) responsible especially for decisions concerning political and military questions (cf. 1 S. 5:8,11; 7:7; 29:6; 1 Ch. 12:20[19]).

---

9. Lehmann, 104.
10. M. Noth, *Könige 1–16. BK* IX/1 (²1983), 157f.; A. Reichert, "Kultgeräte," *BRL*², 194.
11. Cf. H. Weippert, "Wagen," *BRL*², 356.
12. Tiktin takes a different, but not persuasive, view.
13. Cf. *ANET,* 284-86, 291, 308.
14. So Jones, 130, 154.
15. See H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 498.
16. *ANET,* 291.

III. Religio-Cultic Associations. The root *srn* only indirectly exhibits any religio-cultic associations. In the meaning "axle," the noun refers to part of the so-called basin wagons belonging to the inventory of the Jerusalem temple (1 K. 7:30) and symbolizing the cosmic power of the ocean or serving cultic cleansing procedures.[17] As a reference to the Philistine rulers, it comes into contact with the religio-cultic sphere only insofar as these rulers control the fate of Yahweh's ark after it falls into the hands of the Philistine army (1 S. 5:8,11). Here the *s^erānîm* must acknowledge Yahweh's power and superiority (6:12,16).

Schunck

---

17. Noth, *Könige 1–16*, 161f.

סרר *srr* I; סָרָה *sārâ;* סַר *sar*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. OT Occurrences. II. General Use. III. Theological Use: 1. *sārar;* 2. *sārâ.* IV. Qumran. V. LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The lexemes *sārar* I, "be stubborn, rebellious," *sārâ* II, "rebelliousness, falseness," and *sar,* "bad tempered, morose," all derive from the root *srr,* which in Hebrew means "be stubborn, rebellious," in Akkadian "be unstable, false, untrue, deceitful," and is probably related linguistically to the Arab. verb *šarra,* "be bad, evil,

---

srr I. A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel,* 7 vols. (Leipzig, 1908-14; repr. 1968), II, 288, 306; IV, 211f.; E. Jenni, "Dtn 19,16: *sarā* 'Falschheit,'" *De la Tôrah au Messie. FS H. Cazelles. AOAT* 212 (1981), 201-11; A. Jepsen, "Gottesmann und Prophet," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 171-82, esp. 179f. (concerning *mārâ*); R. Knierim, "מרה *mrh* to be obstinate," *TLOT,* II, 687f.; J. van der Ploeg, "Notes lexicographiques," *OTS* 5 (1948) 142-50, esp. 142ff.; M. Schorr, "Einige hebräisch-babylonische Redensarten," *MGWJ* 53 (1909) 432f.

On I: A. Caquot, M. Sznycer, and A. Herdner, *Textes ougaritiques,* I, *Mythes et légendes* (Paris, 1974), 218 n. t; M. Dahood, "Ugaritic and Phoenician or Qumran and the Versions," *Orient and Occident. FS C. H. Gordon. AOAT* 22 (1973), 53-58; A. Guillaume, "Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography: A Comparative Study III," *Abr-Nahrain* 3 (1961/62) 1-10, esp. 6; J. C. de Moor and K. Spronk, "Problematical Passages in the Legend of Kirtu (I)," *UF* 14 (1982) 153-71, esp. 161.

On II: G. R. Driver, "Problems in 'Proverbs,'" *ZAW* 50 (1932) 141-48, esp. 141f.; M. Rotenberg and B. L. Diamond, "The Biblical Conception of Psychopathy: The Law of the Stubborn and Rebellious Son," *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 7/1 (Durham, N.C., 1971) 29-38.

On III: F. Hesse, *Das Verstockungsproblem im AT. BZAW* 74 (1955).

malicious."[1] Ugaritic attests the root *srr* once as *ystrn* with the meaning "to be rebellious."[2] Only the occurrence in Isa. 14:6, *sārâ* I, "cessation," derives from → סור *sûr*, "turn aside." The corresponding interpretive tendency in Samaritan and Jewish Aramaic is etymologically secondary.[3] The original, quite concrete meaning of *srr*, "be stubborn, rebellious" (cf. Hos. 4:16: a stubborn heifer), apparently developed in Akkadian into the more abstract sense of unstable, false behavior, and then acquired in Arabic the completely general meaning "be bad."

The paramount synonym for *srr* is → מרה *mārâ*, which similarly means "be stubborn, rebellious"; cf. the formulaic expression *sôrēr (sorēr) ûmôreh (ûmōreh)* in Dt. 21:18,20; Ps. 78:8; Jer. 5:23. Once the parallel term is the qal fem. ptcp. of *hāmâ* (Prov. 7:11). The paramount antonym is → שמע *šmʿ*, "listen, obey" (cf. Dt. 21:18,20; also Zec. 7:11). The word field of *srr* also includes *qšh* (hiphil) *ʿōrep*, "stiffen one's neck" (Neh. 9:29); *hālak badderek lō-ṭôb*, "walk in a way that is not good" (Isa. 65:2); *sûr*, "turn aside" (Jer. 5:23); *hālak rākîl*, "go about with slanders"; and *šḥt* (hiphil), "act corruptly" (Jer. 6:28).

In the meaning "rebelliousness," *sārâ* II is the object of the verbs *ysp* hiphil, "add, continue to do," or *ʿmq* hiphil, "deepen" (Isa. 1:5; 31:6). Synonyms for *sārâ* II, "falseness," include → שקר *šeqer*, "lie, deception" (cf. Dt. 19:18; Jer. 28:15; 29:31). In this meaning *sārâ* occurs as the object of *verba dicendi*, including *ʿnh b^{e}*, "accuse someone" (Dt. 19:16), *dibber ʿal* or *ʾel*, "speak against someone" (including Yahweh; Dt. 13:6[Eng. v. 5]; Jer. 29:32 [also 28:16]; cf. also Isa. 59:13 with the par. obj. *ʿōšeq*).[4] The adj. *sar* occurs twice in the expression *sar w^{e}zāʿēp*, "resentful and sullen" (so NRSV; 1 K. 20:43; 21:4; once as an attribute of *rûaḥ*, 1 K. 21:5).

2. *OT Occurrences.* The verb is attested 17 times in the MT: 2 in Deuteronomy, 3 in Isaiah, 2 in Jeremiah, 3 in Hosea, 1 in Zechariah, 4 in the Psalms, 1 each in Proverbs and Nehemiah. To this one can add the conjecture in Hos. 7:14. Except for Hos. 4:16 *(sārar)* and the conjecture in Hos. 7:14 *(yāsōrû)*, all these occurrences are forms of the qal participle used attributively or as predicates in nominal sentences. The verb *srr* thus describes a condition or manner of behavior.

The 2 occurrences of *sārâ* II with the meaning "rebelliousness, stubbornness," are in Isaiah; of the 5 with the meaning "falseness," 2 are in Deuteronomy, and the other 3 (Isa. 31:6; Jer. 28:16; 29:32) are suspected of being addenda.[5] The form *sar*, "resentful, vexed," is attested only in prophetic narratives (1 K. 20:43; 21:4,5).

The construct form *sārê* in Jer. 6:28 is sometimes understood as a qal ptcp. of *sûr*,

---

1. Cf. Wehr, 420b; *HAL*, II, 770, s.v. *srr* I; *AHw*, II, 1028; K. Deller, "LúLul = Lúparriṣu und Lúsarru," *Or* 30 (1961) 255ff.; cf. also Jenni.

2. Dahood, 58; *KTU*, 1.4, VII, 48; but cf. G. Del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaan* (Madrid, 1981), 597, who understands the word as a Gt form of *sr[y]* and translates with *exaltarse* ("become eager, enthusiastic").

3. Cf. Jastrow, 1023; also *HAL*, II, 769, s.v. *sārâ* II.

4. Concerning the emendation to *ʿiqqēš*, see *KBL*[2], 744b; or to *ʿōqeš*, see *BHS* in loc.

5. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja (28–39). BK* X/3 (1982); and *BHS* in loc.

and sometimes derived from the adj. *sar,* but is actually to be read *śārê* (from *śar*), or is to be deleted entirely.[6]

II. General Use. The figurative expression *wayyitt^enû kāṯēp sōrāreṯ,* "and they turned a stubborn shoulder" (Zec. 7:11; Neh. 9:29), still evokes the "stubborn heifer" (Hos. 4:16) that resists the yoke and will not be disciplined. The occurrences in Dt. 21:18-21 refer to analogous behavior within a family (cf. 11QT 64:2f.). If a (grown) son is incorrigibly "stubborn and rebellious" (vv. 18,20), the parents' last chance is to bring charges against him before the elders at the gate, whereupon a guilty verdict results in the death penalty (v. 21). Obstinate rebelliousness toward the family head is intensified disobedience (cf. the repeated *lō' šmʿ b^eqôl* in vv. 18,20) and thus a capital crime, albeit one whose penalty at the time Deuteronomy was authored could no longer be pursued by the paterfamilias himself. The wisdom teacher (Prov. 7:11) finds the motive of "sexual promiscuity" behind the inappropriate behavior of the married woman ("loud and wayward") toward the young man.[7]

In the meaning "falseness, wrongdoing," *sārâ* II occurs only once in a secular-historical context, Dt. 19:16 (cf. 11QT 61:8). This passage presupposes the suspicion that a witness has testified falsely,[8] something that in its own turn must be demonstrated in the ensuing trial (vv. 17ff.).

The 2 occurrences of *sar,* "vexed, resentful," in 1 K. 21 (vv. 4f.) characterize the disposition of a king (Ahab) who has encountered the limits of royal power in a free Israelite who refuses to sell his property. The third occurrence (1 K. 20:43) probably comes from the same hand as 2 K. 21:4. Ahab's resentful mood in this war narrative (one transferred from Joash to Ahab) results from the king having been provoked by the prophet's fictitious story (1 K. 20:35-42) into passing a death sentence that in reality would apply to himself.

III. Theological Use. Virtually all the occurrences of this root exhibit theologically relevant features.

1. *sārar.* It was probably Hosea who first compared Israel's incorrigible behavior with that of a "stubborn heifer" (*pārâ sōrērâ,* Hos. 4:16), for they did not heed the warning (cf. 4:15) to turn away from a Yahweh cult overrun with elements of Baʿal. "The imagery belongs within the purview of the obduracy motif."[9]

In the explicative oracle of threat in Hos. 7:13-16, Yahweh charges that Israel "rebels against me [completely?]" (7:14).[10] Whereas the prophet is more inclined to understand the people's depraved cult (cf. the fertility rites in v. 14) as ingratitude (cf.

---

6. See, respectively, W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), in loc.; *KBL²*, 667a; *HAL,* II, 768; *BHS* in loc.

7. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), in loc.

8. Cf. Jenni, 205.

9. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 91.

10. *BHS* suggests reading *yāsōrû* for the conj. *yāsûrû* according to the Targs., Syr., and the context; *HAL,* II, 770, reads *sārôr yāsôrû.*

v. 15) and insubordination or disrespect (cf. in v. 16 the comparison with the defective bow) toward Yahweh, the Masoretes interpret this behavior as apostasy *(sûr).*

Hos. 9:15 justifies Yahweh's decision to drive Ephraim from Yahweh's house (i.e., from the land; cf. 9:11-13) by pointing out that "all their officials are rebels" *(kol śōrêhem sōrᵉrîm).* This refers to the royal officials who by failing to implement God's justice are rebellious toward both Yahweh and the prophet; by acting thus they falsify their own commission, as suggested by the conscious assonance *śōrêhem* (Leningrad Codex!) *sōrᵉrîm.* Considering that a similar (Isaianic) divine oracle qualifies Jerusalem's leaders (*śārayiḵ,* "your princes" [so NRSV], Isa. 1:23) as "rebellious," this probably represents a familiar, standard expression.[11] Instead of doing their duty, such as providing for the rights of widows and orphans, these "companions of thieves" *(ḥaḇrê gannāḇîm)* and lovers of bribes (cf. *'ōhēḇ šōḥaḏ, rōḏēp̄ šalmōnîm*) do exactly the opposite.

Foreign affairs is the sphere addressed by the cry of woe that Isa. 30:1 formulates as a divine oracle (cf. vv. 2-5) against the "rebellious children" *(bānîm sôrᵉrîm)* who are forging an alliance as an anti-Assyrian "plan" *('ēṣâ)* against Yahweh's will, thereby "heaping" sin upon sin.[12] These "children" are referring only to Judah's leaders (cf. 28:14; 29:15; differently in 1:2). Their political aims constitute rebellion against Yahweh by contradicting the requirement to trust only in Yahweh (7:9a). Dt. 21:18-21 shows what punishment awaits such rebellious children.

In the divine oracle Jer. 5:20-25, Yahweh insists that "this people has a stubborn and rebellious heart" (*lēḇ sôrēr ûmôreh,* 5:23). The author introduces a fine example of assonance in pointing out that this willful and rebellious attitude manifests itself in apostasy *(sārû wayyēlēḵû)* such that the rebelliousness *(srr)* itself is revealed in apostasy *(sûr).* The prophet concludes in 6:28 that "all are stubbornly rebellious" *(sôrᵉrîm),* "going about with slanders" *(hōlᵉḵê rāḵîl)* and "acting corruptly" *(mašḥîṯîm).* According to the postexilic prophecy in Isa. 65:1-16a, Yahweh held out his hands "all day long to a rebellious and stubborn people" (*'am sôrēr ûmôreh* according to 1QIsa[a]) "who walk in a way that is not good, following their own devices" (65:2), an allusion to forbidden cultic activity (cf. 65:3b-5a,7a).

After a historical retrospective within the framework of a Yahweh response (Zec. 7:4–8:23), those who were addressed by earlier prophets "turned a stubborn shoulder" (*wayyittᵉnû kāṯēp̄ sōrāreṯ,* 7:11). The context here ("refuse to listen, . . . stop one's ears, . . . make one's heart adamant in order not to hear," vv. 11f.) ultimately identifies the obduracy of preexilic Israel as both conscious and willful.

The (Chronicler's) prayer in Neh. 9:5b-37 circumscribes the people's rejection of the prophetic message with the same expression as does Zec. 7:11 (Neh. 9:29), then amplifies it with the metaphor "stiffened their neck" and summarizes it in the expression "and they would not obey." This not only explains the "failing" of the preexilic prophets but also traces the people's presumption (*zîḏ* hiphil), their refusal to obey

---

11. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), in loc.
12. So *BHS.*

Yahweh's commandments, and their "sin" *(ḥṭ')* against his ordinances (Neh. 9:29a) back to conscious obduracy. The Deuteronomistic theology of history is even more evident here than in Zec. 7:11ff.

The Deuteronomistically inclined historical Ps. 78 similarly confronts the errant people (cf. vv. 1ff.) with their ancestors as a deterrent, as "a stubborn and rebellious generation *(dôr sôrēr ûmōreh),* a generation whose heart was not steadfast *(dôr lō' hēḵîn libbô),* whose spirit was not faithful to God *(w^e lō' ne'emnâ 'eṯ-'ēl rûḥô)*" (v. 8). Vacillation and weakness of faith are confirmed by the ancestors' attitude toward God's "covenant" *(b^e rîṯ)* and torah (v. 10) as well as by their failure to remember God's great deeds at the exodus (v. 11).

According to Ps. 66(A), "the rebellious cannot exalt themselves" in the face of God's majesty and power (*'al yārûmû* [Q], v. 7), referring originally (cf. v. 3) probably to God's enemies, now (cf. vv. 7-12) to Israel's enemies. According to Ps. 68:7(6), it is only the "rebellious" who "live in a parched land," i.e., in hopeless spiritual desperation.[13]

2. *sārâ.* After Jerusalem is surrounded, Isaiah asks his fellow citizens what should be done with them, now that they "increase" (*ysp* hiphil) "rebelliousness" *(sārâ),* i.e., continue to behave rebelliously or persist in rebellious behavior (Isa. 1:5). Their sin is precisely this persistent abiding in apostasy from Yahweh (*'zb, n'ṣ* piel; 1:4).

Isa. 31:6f. calls Israel to turn back *(šûḇ)* to him against whom they "have deepened rebelliousness" (*la'^a šer he'mîqû sārâ,* v. 6), i.e., toward whom they have fallen into such profound rebelliousness; this is something different from "profound apostasy." V. 7 foresees a turn away from idolatry, which is what in the redactor's opinion actually constitutes Israel's rebelliousness, whereas Isaiah is more inclined to view it as lack of faith.

According to Dt. 13:2-6(1-5) (cf. 11QT 54:15), any prophet who with miraculous signs entices one to follow other gods (v. 3[2]) is to be put to death "for having spoken false things [lit. 'falseness'; NRSV 'treason'] against Yahweh your God" (v. 6[5]; *kî dibber-sārâ 'al-YHWH*). The construction here already precludes speaking of "rebellion." The prophet's false statement about Yahweh actually consists in denying that it is Yahweh and no other whom Israel is to follow as its God.

According to the equivalent formulation in Jer. 28:16 (here: *'el*) and 29:32 (*'al*) (both obvious glosses following Dt. 13:6), both the false prophets Hananiah and Shemaiah have distorted Yahweh's historical plan by issuing fateful prophecies of salvation. In addition to apostasy, disloyalty toward Yahweh, and deviation from following his ways (v. 13a), the people's confession of sin in Isa. 59:12-15a enumerates the following transgressions: "speaking (*dbr* piel) what is distorted (conj. *'ōqeš* or *'iqqēš*) and false *(sārâ)*" as well as "words of deception" (*diḇrê-šāqer,* v. 13b). All these sins are the results of apostasy, and are the reason justice and righteousness have vanished (v. 14).

13. In Ps. 68:19b the phrase "and also rebellious ones — in order to be enthroned, Yahweh, God," is incomprehensible, and is probably a gloss after v. 7b. Cf. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1989), 47.

IV. Qumran. Occurrences of *srr* within the characteristic Qumran writings are concentrated in CD (*srr:* 4 times, twice as citations; *dbr srh:* twice). CD 1:13f. cites Hos. 4:16 and peculiarly refers it to those "who departed from the way" *(sry drk).* But this can hardly be understanding *srr* in a manner influenced by *sûr,* "depart from, deviate," since *sry drk* is correctly interpreting the immediately preceding *'dt bwgdym* ("congregation of traitors," CD 1:12). Rather, the author has added the Hosea citation associatively in order to demonstrate, using early Jewish exegesis, that the "apostasy" or "refusal" of the majority toward the Qumran community is actually commensurate with Scripture. CD 2:6 clearly qualifies the same group as *srry drk,* "those who resist the way," and as *mt'by ḥq,* "those who abhor the precept." According to 1QS 10:20f., the instructor must confess that he will have no pity on "all who resist the way" *(swrry drk;* Maier: "who deviate from the way"; Lohse: "who depart from the way"), nor will he comfort "the smitten" *(nk'ym).* The Community Rule is thus demanding delimitation instead of mission activities. In 1QH 5:24f. the petitioner (the Teacher of Righteousness?) confesses (among other things) that "the men of my [following] have rebelled *(swrrym)* and have murmured (*mlynym,* from *lûn* hiphil) round about me." Here the suffix of the 1st person sg. suggests that "rebelliousness" is referring to community members. According to CD 11:7, if a head of livestock is "stubborn" *(swrrt)* on the sabbath, its owner shall not take it out of his house.

Contrary to appearance (Maier, Lohse), the expression already familiar from the OT, *dbr srh ('l),* does not have the meaning "dissuade (from)," and certainly not "preach rebellion (against)" in Qumran, but rather "say something false (about)," as in CD 5:21 (about God's commandments) and as suggested by the parallel statement, "and they prophesied lies" *(wynb'w šqr)* in 6:1. Similarly, 12:3 (following Dt. 13:2-6) is hardly talking about preaching apostasy (Maier, Lohse), but rather about the "false (deceptive) statements" of a man who has come "under the dominion of the spirits of Belial" (l. 2). Hence in Qumran both *srr* and *srh* are to be viewed against the backdrop of the resistance and "apostasy" of the majority, and serve the sect's own understanding of the traditional problem of religious obduracy.

V. LXX. The LXX uses various equivalents for *srr* and *sārâ,* including especially forms of *apeithéō,* "be disobedient" (Dt. 21:18,20; Ps. 67[LXX 68]:19[Eng. 18]; Isa. 59:13; Hos. 9:15), though also *parapikraínō,* "embitter" (Ps. 67[68]:7[6]; 77[78]:8[7]); *paraoistráō,* "rouse, challenge" (Hos. 4:16[bis]); the nominal forms *anḗkoos,* "disobedient" (Jer. 5:23; 6:28); *apostátēs,* "apostate" (Isa. 30:1); *ásōtos,* "morally corrupt" (Prov. 7:11). Extremely free and utterly deviating translations occur in Dt. 13:6(5) *(planáō);* Isa. 1:5 *(anomía);* 31:6 *(boulḗ ánomos).* The general inclination is thus to theologize (and moralize), and is especially evident in the rendering of the vivid expression in Neh. 9:29 (or Zec. 7:11): *édōkan nṓton apeithoúnta* (or *paraphronoúnta).* The LXX renders the adj. *sar* with participial forms: *synkechyménos* (1 K. 21[20]:43), and *tetaragménos* (1 K. 20[21]:4,5).

Ruppert

סָתַם sāṯam; שָׂתַם śāṯam; שָׁתַם šāṯam

Contents: I. Etymology, Occurrences. II. Literal Meaning: "Plug Up, Stop Up" (Flows of Water, etc.). III. Figurative Meaning: "Keep Secret" (Messages, etc.). IV. *šāṯam* in the Balaam Oracles. V. Qumran and LXX.

I. Etymology, Occurrences. The root *stm* with the meaning "stop up, close off," is apparently restricted to OT Hebrew and to the later developmental forms of Hebrew (Middle Hebrew) and Aramaic (Jewish Aramaic, Syriac, Mandaic). Connections with Akk. *šutummu,* "storehouse, reservoir," and the Arab. verbs *sadama* and *saṭama,* "close (a door)," are uncertain (*šutummu* is a Sumerian loanword). Some scholars have taken exception to the occurrence of the root in Imperial Aramaic (Passover Papyrus from Elephantine; most read *wḥtmw,* "sealed," following Sachau and Cowley; only P. Joüon and P. Grelot read *wstmw,* "keep closed").[1] In addition to the normal form, the orthographical variant *śāṯam* (Lam. 3:8) also occurs in the OT. By contrast, the two occurrences of the verb *šāṯam* (Nu. 24:3,15) cannot without further qualification be identified with *sāṯam* or *śāṯam* or emended.[2] The root occurs altogether approximately 15 times in the OT, once in Sirach, and 3 times in the Qumran writings.

II. Literal Meaning: "Plug Up, Stop Up" (Flows of Water, etc.). The etiological narrative about the disputes over wells between Isaac's people and Abimelech (Gen. 26) recounts that the Philistines harassed him by stopping up (*stm* piel) his wells and filling them with earth (vv. 15,18). The account of the common Israelite-Judean campaign against Moab (2 K. 3:4-27) mentions a similar measure taken in war. "Every spring of water they stopped up (*stm* qal), and every good tree they felled" (2 K. 3:25; the same expressions occur in the prophetic oracle, v. 19).

In reverse fashion, the defenders of Jerusalem try to make Sennacherib's assault as difficult as possible by stopping up all the springs outside the city as well as "the wadi that flowed through the land" (2 Ch. 32:3f.). This refers presumably to the older shafts leading to the spring of Gihon, perhaps in connection with the complex of the Siloam tunnel as described with similar wording (*stm* qal) and in more detail in 2 Ch. 32:30

---

sāṯam. W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (Garden City, N.Y., 1968); J. M. Allegro, "The Meaning of the Phrase ŠEṮŪM HĀʿAYIN in Num. XXIV 3,15," *VT* 3 (1953) 78f.; E. R. Dalglish, *Psalm Fifty-One in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Patternism* (Leiden, 1962); S. Mowinckel, "טחות und שכוי. Eine Studie zur Astrologie des ATs," *AcOr* 8 (1929) 1-44; D. Vetter, *Seherspruch und Segensschilderung. CThM* 4 (1974).

1. Cf. *AP,* 21:9; Joüon, "Notes grammaticales, lexicographiques et philologiques sur les papyrus araméens d'Egypte," *MUSJ* 18 (1934) 65f.; Grelot, "Etudes sur le 'papyrus paschal' d'Eléphantine," *VT* 4 (1954) 382f.; cf. *DNSI,* I, 413.

2. See IV below.

(cf. 2 K. 20:20). In a different historical context, the gaps in the city wall are rebuilt, i.e., bricked up (*stm* niph.; Neh. 4:1[Eng. v. 7]).

Zech. 14:5 is more difficult. At the final battle, Yahweh will stand on the Mount of Olives. "The Mount of Olives shall be split in two from east to west by a very wide valley," whereby "one half of the mount shall withdraw northward, and the other half southward." Furthermore, "the valley of my mountains [Hinnom] shall be stopped up" (*stm* niphal). This reading admittedly requires an emendation, since the MT reads *nastem* ("you shall flee," from *nûs*).[3] The same form occurs twice later in the verse, where it probably needs no emendation.[4] The expression "a mouth that is closed" *(ph stwm)* in Sir. 30:18 has no OT parallel.

III. Figurative Meaning: "Keep Secret" (Messages, etc.). The root *stm* occurs 3 times in the book of Daniel, again in an apocalyptic context, but this time with figurative meaning. Here it involves "sealing up, closing off," i.e., keeping a message secret until a certain time. After interpreting the vision of the ram and the goat, the angel tells Daniel, "as for you, seal up (*stm* qal) the vision, for it refers to many days from now" (Dnl. 8:26). These "many days from now" are actually the last days (cf. vv. 17,19), and the idea is characteristically apocalyptic. The message is to be kept secret in written form. The concluding section of the book insists that "you, Daniel, keep the words secret (*stm* qal) and the book sealed until the time of the end" (Dnl. 12:4). V. 9 reads similarly: "kept secret (*stm* qal pass. ptcp.) and sealed until the time of the end." Here apocalyptic literature has begun using *stm* and *ḥtm* as technical terms.[5]

These ideas appear in other apocalyptic contexts as well (e.g., 1 Enoch 1:2) and can be traced back at least in part to Ezekiel (cf. Ezk. 12:27). Strikingly, the book of Ezekiel itself uses the word *sāṯam* in connection precisely with a Daniel figure. The prince of Tyre is told, "You are indeed wiser *(ḥāḵām)* than Daniel; no secret *(sāṯûm)* is hidden from you" (Ezk. 28:3).[6] The wisdom of Daniel and of the prince of Tyre encompasses knowledge inaccessible to normal persons,[7] and perhaps includes esoteric teaching.[8]

Ps. 51:8(6) similarly associates *ḥkm* and *stm*. The verse has usually been translated: "You have pleasure in truth in what is hidden *(baṭṭuḥôṯ)*, and in what is secret *(bᵉsāṯum)* you teach me wisdom *(ḥoḵmâ)*."[9] In this view the verse is interpreted in connection with v. 7(5) and is understood to be speaking about "insight into the hidden depths of the degeneracy of guilt."[10] Or the two words refer to "the hidden inward be-

---

3. Cf. W. Rudolph, *Haggai — Sacharja 1–8, 9–14 — Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 231.

4. Additional suggestions in B. Otzen, *Studien über Deuterosacharja* (Copenhagen, 1964), 267f.; and M. Sæbø, *Sacharja 9–14. WMANT* 34 (1969), 110-15.

5. → חתם *ḥāṯam* V (V, 268f.).

6. Concerning the last verb, see W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 74f.; *HAL*, II, 846.

7. Cf. H.-P. Müller, "Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik," *Congress Volume, Uppsala 1971. SVT* 22 (1972), 277f.

8. Albright, 216.

9. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 499.

10. Ibid., 504.

ing," i.e., a person's conscience.[11] E. R. Dalglish finds a better understanding: in connection with v. 7(5), both *ṭuḥôṯ* and *sāṯum* refer to the womb.[12] That is, a person experiences the divine will already as an embryo, and is thus already responsible even before birth. This interpretation draws support from Ps. 139:15 (cf. Bab. *Nid.* 30b), according to which a person becomes acquainted with the torah as an embryo.[13] Ps. 139 emphasizes Yahweh's ability to know even what is hidden.

Other interpretations of Ps. 51:8(6), in part influenced by Job 38:36, tend more in the direction of mythology and astrology. In this view, *ṭuḥôṯ* is associated with the Egyptian god of wisdom, Thoth, and *sāṯum* is understood as a code name for his star, Saturn.[14] W. F. Albright and M. Dahood take slightly different approaches.[15]

The figurative meaning in Lam. 3:8 is quite transparent. "Though I call and cry for help, he shuts out my prayer" (*śtm,* a secondary form of *stm;* many mss. have *sāṯam* itself).[16] God has blocked the path of the petitioner's words to heaven, something expressed even more unequivocally in v. 44.

IV. *šāṯam* in the Balaam Oracles. The Balaam cycle twice contains a formula in which Balaam is described as *haggeḇer šᵉṯum hā'ayin* (Nu. 24:3,15). Treatment of the root *stm* touches on the problems attaching to the root *štm.* The versions offer different interpretations of the expression, and modern commentators and translators accordingly also take different approaches.

1. The Vulg. apparently associates *štm* with *stm* and translates *obturatus,* "stopped up, closed." Several exegetes offer a similar translation: "whose eye is closed," either understanding *štm* as a secondary form of *śtm* or of *stm,* or altering the form to *śᵉṯum.*[17]

2. The LXX and Targs. understand the text differently. The LXX translates as *ho ánthrōpos ho alēthinós horṓn,* the Targs. as *gaḇrā' dᵉsappîr ḥāzê,* both yielding "the man who truly sees." Taking this as his point of departure, J. Wellhausen suggests reading "*šettammâ 'ayin (še = 'ᵃšer +* the root *tmm),* "whose eye is perfect."[18] With lesser modifications and a reference to the Arslan Tash inscription and to *šhtm* in 4QTest (4Q175) 10, this particular reading has attained some popularity.[19]

---

11. R. Kittel, *Die Psalmen. KAT* XIII (3/41922), 191.

12. Dalglish, 67-69, 123-27.

13. Ibid., 124f.

14. Mowinckel, 8-14, 28-43.

15. Albright, 212-16; Dahood, *Psalms 51–100. AB* 17 (1968), 4f.

16. But see *GesB,* 795; J. Blau, *On Pseudo-Corrections in Some Semitic Languages* (Jerusalem, 1970), 121.

17. For the former see *KD,* III, 186f.; G. Hölscher, *Die Profeten* (1914), 119. For the latter see A. Dillmann, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua. KEHAT* 13 (Leipzig, 21886), 156; *HAL,* III, 1363; *BHK.*

18. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des ATs* (Berlin, 31899; 41963), 351.

19. See *BHK* and *BHS; KAI,* 27:16; Albright, 13; J. Allegro, *DJD,* V (1968), 58. Cf. S. Mowinckel, "Der Ursprung der Bilāmsage," *ZAW* 48 (1930) 246; K. Seybold, "Das Herrscherbild des Bileamorakels Num. 24,15-19," *TZ* 29 (1973), 2; Vetter, 27, 101; M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake, Ind., 1980), 190, etc.

3. The Syr. follows an ancient Jewish tradition in translating d^e*galyā' 'ênēh,* "whose eye is opened." Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, and other medieval rabbinic sources keep the form *š^{e}tum,* understanding the passage on the basis of various mishnaic and talmudic occurrences of a verbal form *šātam.*[20] In Middle Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic the verb means "bore through, open (a wine barrel)."[21] This understanding is preferable (cf. also Luther); it is supported not only by the parallelism with the formulation at the end of vv. 4 and 16 ("with eyes uncovered") but also by the apocalyptic expression, "Enoch, a righteous man whose eyes had been opened by God" (1 Enoch 1:2).[22]

4. Unpersuasive attempts have been made by A. B. Ehrlich and J. M. Allegro to understand *štm* in Nu. 24:3,15 on the basis of the Arab. verb *šatama,* "be malicious," or of the adj. *šatīm,* "austere, grim-faced."[23]

Otzen

V. Qumran and LXX. The root *stm* occurs 3 times in the writings of Qumran (4Q503 75:1 is corrupt, though *hstm* is conjectured). According to 3Q15 17, *stwm* refers to a "stopped-up, closed" cistern as the repository for an extremely large amount of money. 4Q503 frs. 1-6, 3:7 cites a prayer: "Blessed be the God of Israel who *hides* [the moon?]."

The LXX usually translates the verb with *phrássein* or its compounds. In isolated instances it also uses *kalýptein, katakalýptein, sphragízein,* and *krýphios.*

Fabry

---

20. See Allegro, "Meaning," 78.
21. *ANH,* 415.
22. Cf. M. Noth, *Numbers. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1968), 149; N. H. Snaith, *Leviticus and Numbers. NCBC* (1967), 296f.; H.-P. Müller, "Die aramäische Inschrift von Deir 'Allā und die älteren Bileamsprüche," *ZAW* 94 (1982) 240. On 1 Enoch see S. Uhlig, *Das äthiopische Henochbuch. JSHRZ* 5/6 (1984), 507.
23. A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel,* II (1909), 203; Allegro, "Meaning," 78f.

סָתַר *sātar;* סֵתֶר *sēṯer;* סִתְרָה *siṯrâ;* מִסְתּוֹר *mistôr;* מַסְתֵּר *mastēr;* מִסְתָּר *mistār*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Occurrences and OT Use. III. Verbal Use: 1. Niphal and Hithpael; 2. Hiphil and Piel. IV. Nominal Forms: 1. *sēṯer* and *siṯrâ;* 2. *mistār, mistôr,* and *mastēr.* V. Qumran and LXX.

I. Etymology. While not entirely absent from the earlier Semitic languages, *str* seems to be a root attested primarily in the later ones. Akk. *šitru,* "veil,"[1] might be related (cf. Syr. *setrā* and Mand. *sitara,* "veil"), perhaps also Egyp. *mśtrt,* "apron." Ugar. *ẓtr* is uncertain.[2] The OSA root *str* means "protect,"[3] while Sam., Jewish Aram, Syr., Mand., Arab., Eth., and Tigre *str* are translated as "hide." The fundamental meaning "hide" seems to remain consistent across the spectrum, and modifications such as "protect" (Old South Arabic), "cover" (Mandaic) can easily be traced back to it. The root *śtr* in the meaning "destroy," "be broken up" (Hebrew, perhaps also Samaritan), represents an independent root. Apart from the OT, *str* also occurs relatively frequently in Qumran, and several times in the Hebrew text of Sirach.

II. Occurrences and OT Use. In OT Hebrew, *str* occurs altogether 128 times (plus 3 in Sirach) in both verbal (81 times) and nominal forms. The word also occurs once in Biblical Aramaic in the pael (Dnl. 2:22). Occurrences include 30 in the niphal, 44 in the hiphil (understanding *mastēr* in Isa. 53:3 as a derivative noun), 5 in the hithpael, and once each in the piel and pual. The transitive meaning ("hide") comes to expression in the hiphil and piel, the reflexive and passive meaning ("hide oneself," "be hidden") in the niphal, hithpael, and pual. Adverbial qualifications are rendered with *min* (hide from someone) and *bᵉ* (in a hiding place). The meaning "hide" can be understood in the sense of "being removed" or "withdrawing" on the one hand, and in the sense of "take flight" or "protect" on the other. All these semantic nuances can be derived from the basic meaning "hide." Nominal forms include 34 occurrences of *sēṯer,* "hiding place, shelter," 10 occurrences of *mistār* with the same meaning, and once each of *siṯrâ,* "refuge, shelter," *mistôr,* perhaps "shelter," and *mastēr,* "veiling, cloaking" (unless one understands this derivative as a hiphil participle). Twice this root seems to have contributed to personal names: *siṯrî* (Ex. 6:22) and *sᵉṯûr* (Nu. 13:13).[4]

Use of *str* always involves a personal relationship. The subject is almost always a person (exceptions being Job 3:10; Isa. 59:2), while the other relational elements (object or circumstances or both) can be either a person or circumstances (also in the figurative sense). Although most occurrences involve the description of theological rela-

---

sāṯar. S. E. Balentine, "A Description of the Semantic Field of Hebrew Words for 'Hide,'" *VT* 30 (1980) 137-53; idem, *The Hidden God: The Hiding of the Face of God in the OT* (Oxford, 1983); E. R. Friedman, "The Biblical Expression *mastîr pānîm,*" *HAR* 1 (1977) 139-48; J. G. Heintz, "De l'absence de la statue divine au 'Dieu qui se cache'" [Isa. 45:15], *RHPR* 59 (1979) 427-37; P. Hugger, *Jahwe meine Zuflucht. MüSt* 13 (1971), 58-116, 147ff.; L. Perlitt, "Die Verborgenheit Gottes," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 367-82; H. Schrade, *Der verborgene Gott: Gottesbild und Gottesvorstellung in Israel und im Alten Orient* (Stuttgart, 1949); G. Wehmeier, "סתר *str* hi. to hide," *TLOT,* II, 813-19.

1. *AHw,* III, 1252a.
2. See *HAL,* II, 771, with bibliography.
3. Biella, 347.
4. Concerning *siṯrî,* cf. G. Rinaldi, "בְּקֶרֶב, קֶרֶב," *BibOr* 3 (1961) 129, who refers to Amor. *sitrê baḫlum* (*ARM,* VIII, 40, 12), "my shelter is Baʿal"; concerning *sᵉṯûr,* cf. *IPN,* 158; *APNM,* 253f.

tionships and connections, the OT also uses the root in secular contexts. Most occurrences are found in the later OT writings, with a striking accumulation in the Psalms (37 times), wisdom literature (13 time in Job, 8 in Proverbs), and in Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah (11 times). Noteworthy parallel concepts include → חבא *ḥb'*, → טמן *ṭmn*, → כחד *kḥd*, → עלם *'lm*, → צפן *ṣpn*. Certain figures of speech (e.g., God hides his countenance from someone) prompt a wide spectrum of parallel notions depending on the account and the situation. God can reject, refuse to listen, etc. The same applies to contrasting concepts, none of which is really characteristic as such except perhaps for → גלה *glh*, "reveal," "disclose."

III. Verbal Use.

1. *Niphal and Hithpael.* If we view the accounts of Saul's pursuit of David (1 Samuel) as something resembling the story of David's ascent to the throne, then the oldest witnesses for the secular use of *str* niphal and hithpael are found precisely here. David was repeatedly able to hide from Saul (*baśśāḏeh, šām,* "in the field," "there," 1 S. 20:5,19,24 [niphal], according to his arrangements with Jonathan; or in the account of the Ziphites' denunciation of David to Saul in Gibeah, 1 S. 26:1; 23:19 [hithpael]; cf. Ps. 54:2[Eng. v. 1], using b^e to indicate locale, e.g., *bamm*^{e}*ṣāḏôṯ*, "in the strongholds," 1 S. 23:19). In war the weaker hide from the stronger (Dt. 7:20, here the nations of the cultivated land before the intruding Israelites, whom Yahweh has strengthened; this secular notion is used to serve the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic agenda).

Even when Elijah receives God's orders to hide at the Wadi Cherith, this is still a purely secular event (1 K. 17:3). Similarly, Jeremiah and Baruch are advised to hide from Jehoiakim (Jer. 36:19). In one lament, although the helpless and oppressed petitioner is well able to hide from adversaries (Ps. 55:13[12], *w*^{e}*'essāṯēr mimmennû*) and even to bear taunts (*w*^{e}*'eśśā'*), he cannot stand up to the friend who has now become wicked. Here "hide" is to be understood in the sense of "protect oneself."

The antithesis in Prov. 22:3 (cf. 27:12) reflects practical experience. "The clever see danger and hide [*K*]; but the simple go on, and suffer for it." Prov. 28:28 similarly addresses this theme in the form of an antithesis. "When the wicked prevail, people go into hiding; but when they perish, the righteous increase." Elements deriving from creation hymns are coupled with wisdom experiences in the general aphoristic assertion that (ultimately) no one and nothing can hide from the heat of the sun (Ps. 19:7[6]: *w*^{e}*'ên nistār mēḥammāṯô;* also old). Prov. 27:5 is often considered difficult to understand. "Better is open (*m*^{e}*gullâ*) rebuke than hidden [*m*^{e}*sutteret̲*, only occurrence of pual] love"[5] (concerning Prov. 27:5, cf. Sir. 41:14: "concealed [*ṭmn*] wisdom and hidden [pual ptcp.] treasure — of what value is either?"). The second, antithetical element would have to represent a negation of the first (false, not seriously intended, or half-hearted love).

---

5. Cf. W. Bühlmann, *Vom rechten Reden und Schweigen. OBO* 12 (1976), 113-16; see also *BHS*, which suggests reading *mē'êḇâ*, "than hidden hostility," instead of *mē'ah*^{a}*ḇâ*, albeit without offering any textual witnesses.

Sacrally secured legal regulations can also involve secular circumstances from daily life. The procedure for determining divine judgment in the case of suspected adultery (Nu. 5:11-31) presupposes the wife's infidelity, which has remained hidden from her husband (5:13, including both *str* and *'lm* niphal, along with the prepositional qualifier *mē'ênê 'îšāh,* lit. "and she remains hidden from the eyes of her husband and undetected after she has defiled herself" (read *ne'elmâ* with Sam. mss.]).[6] In the contract between Laban and Jacob, an external sign is to witness the validity of the contract in case the contractual partners themselves are absent (Gen. 31:49; cf. the context: *kî nissāṯēr 'îš mērē'ēhû,* "when we are hidden [NRSV 'absent'] one from the other"). These legal regulations are doubtless already quite old, and we thus observe the secular use of *str* (niphal, hithpael, pual) primarily in relatively early OT traditions.

An understanding of the theological use of *str* (niphal, hithpael) can take as its point of departure the fundamental wisdom conviction that wisdom itself is basically accessible only to God (Job 28:23-27), being hidden from both human beings *(kol-ḥay)* and animals (v. 21; *'lm* niphal and *str* niphal, both times with *min*). The birds of the air cannot find wisdom, nor can even the personified figures of Death and the Underworld (v. 22). Human wisdom and cleverness are unable to attain Yahweh's wisdom in judgment and salvation. They must perish and hide (*str* hithpael), as expressed in an Isaianic oracle functioning as a justified announcement of disaster (Isa. 29:14; cf. v. 13). Not only Yahweh's activity but also his very being is such that, ultimately, no one can hide from this God, not even in the depths of the sea (Am. 9:3, *str* niphal with *b*^e^ and *mē'ênay*), nor in any other undetermined, secret places (Jer. 23:24, *'im yissāṯēr 'îš bammistārîm*). Yahweh's penetrating vision (Job 34:21) finds the evildoer, who can find no gloom deep enough *(ḥōšeḵ)* nor any darkness dark enough *(ṣalmāweṯ)* in which to hide (*l*^e^*hissāṯēr šām,* Job 34:22; cf. also Jer. 16:17, next to *str* niphal also *ṣpn* niphal).

This peculiar characteristic of Yahweh's being and activity also has its comforting side, since the sighing *('*^a^*nāḥâ)* of the lamenting petitioner is not concealed before Yahweh (Ps. 38:10[9]). Similarly, the exiles' fate *(dereḵ)* is certainly not unknown to Yahweh, nor is their right *(mišpāṭ)* a matter of indifference to him (Isa. 40:27, *nist*^e^*râ darkî mēYHWH*). When Yahweh himself wishes to forget and conceal, earlier troubles and distress as judgment for sin and apostasy are hidden from his eyes (Isa. 65:16bff.), and he creates everything anew, along with salvation (cf. vv. 17ff.). But if he wishes to chastise, then even compassion *(nōḥam)* conceals itself from his eyes (Hos. 13:14). Job must lament that God is also capable of blocking off (life) paths, such that the *dereḵ* is hidden from the miserable and embittered (Job 3:20,23). The fratricide Cain must certainly leave the presence and protection of God and hide before him (Gen. 4:14, *mippānêḵā 'essāṯēr*). Yet even those who are pious and wise experience dread before God's puzzling nature and must protect (hide) themselves from his countenance (Job 13:20, *str* niphal). Precisely the story of Cain makes clear that Yahweh himself is a refuge in misfortune for those who seek him and act according to his ordinances, a refuge in which one can hide and protect oneself (Zeph. 2:3, niphal passive, "perhaps you may

6. See *BHS.*

be hidden on the day of Yahweh's wrath"). In a reverse fashion, the godless and mockers among Jerusalem's upper classes have made lies and falsehood *(kāzāḇ, šeqer)* their shelter where they try to hide from judgment (Isa. 28:15). By contrast, the person dedicated to the law asks that even hidden (unknown) transgressions *(nistārôṯ)* be forgiven him (Ps. 19:13[12]).

Two interesting theological statements can conclude this section appropriately. Isa. 45:15 contains a summary of Deutero-Isaiah's message: "Truly, you are a God who hides himself [or: 'a hidden God,' *'ēl mistattēr*], O God of Israel, a Savior *(môšîa')*." This confessional statement expresses the entire freedom of Israel's God, a God who withdraws, hides, cannot be comprehended, and who at the same time is engaged as Israel's savior. The statement in Dt. 29:28(29), drawing formally from the language of wisdom, is no less dense. "The secret things *(hannistārôṯ)* belong to Yahweh our God, but the revealed things *(hanniglôṯ)* belong to us and to our children forever, to observe all the words of this law." The *tôrâ* is seen in what is revealed; everything else may be left to Yahweh, including but certainly not limited to the fate of the widely dispersed people of God. What is revealed suffices for both life and death. Hence Sir. 3:22 recommends humility and modesty, and that we not concern ourselves with "what is hidden," but leave alone that which transcends human powers. Only where God himself reveals "hidden things" is darkness illuminated (Sir. 42:19; cf. also Dnl. 2:22: "He reveals [*gālē'*] deep and hidden things [*m^e satt^e rāṯā'*]").

2. *Hiphil and Piel.* The transitive use of the verb *str* is represented by the hiphil and piel. Here, too, a broad spectrum of secular usage can be presupposed even though only a few actual examples can be adduced. Jehosheba rescues her nephew Joash from Athaliah's murderous plans by hiding him from the queen (2 K. 11:2; cf. 2 Ch. 22:11). Jonathan assures David that Saul will hide nothing from him concerning Saul's relationship with David (1 S. 20:2, *yastîr mimmennî haddāḇār hazzeh;* the contrasting term is *glh*). Job 3:10 perhaps also belongs in this context; here Job laments that the night he was conceived did not "hide trouble from my eyes" (*wayyastēr 'āmāl mē'ênāy;* the preceding sentence contains *lō'*). All other occurrences have theological implications.

The acc. obj. of *str* hiphil is often *pānîm.* Moses (ceremoniously) conceals his face after being addressed by the Deity (Ex. 3:6, E). To hide one's face means to withdraw one's presence from another personal entity. Although the Servant of God could easily avoid the insults of his adversaries, he does not even hide his face (Isa. 50:6). By contrast, those around him reject him by hiding their faces from him (53:3, *ûḵ^e mastēr pānîm mimmennû,* either hiphil ptcp. or derivative noun). The context suggests understanding this gesture as an expression of derision and as a refusal to associate with someone.

Only in 25 occurrences do we read that God conceals his face. The negative effects of this sort of (variously justified)[7] behavior are unmistakable. Isa. 8:17 is perhaps one of the oldest passages in this connection. Isaiah wants to hope in precisely the God who has hidden his face from Jacob (the northern kingdom?) and has delivered his people to

7. Balentine, "Description," 152.

the enemy. Mic. 3:4 uses the same figure of speech in an oracle of disaster *(w^e^yastēr pānāw mēhem),* evil deeds having prompted this disaster. Also of interest here is the relationship between Yahweh's refusal to hear their prayers and his "hidden countenance." The announcement of disaster in Jer. 33 (v. 5) circumscribes Yahweh's judgment over Jerusalem similarly. The concealment of the divine face is concretely identical with the Babylonian threat to Jerusalem.[8] Ezk. 39:23,24,29 also use this expression to refer to the oppressive historical events that Yahweh quite consciously inflicts on his people as judgment and punishment for sin and transgression (v. 29, within the framework of an announcement of disaster).[9] Both Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah look back on this catastrophe and essentially prophesy salvation. The actual time of this judgment is considered a "moment" *(reg̱aʿ)* over against which Yahweh's steadfast love and compassion will reign far into the future. "In overflowing wrath for a moment I hid my face from you" (Isa. 54:8). Trito-Isaiah says the same thing, though without *pānîm* (57:17). A Deuteronomistic outline of theological historical reflection virtually fixes as dogma this automatic correspondence between the people's disloyalty and apostasy on the one hand, and Yahweh's judgment on the other (Dt. 31:17f.). The Song of Moses also recounts that Yahweh responds to transgressions against him in the course of history by hiding his face before the people (32:20), something manifesting itself in natural and historical catastrophes.

This figure of speech and the notion itself of God's hidden countenance play a significant role in the Psalms, especially in laments. Cultic predications make clear that the presence of God's countenance means life, prosperity, and health (Nu. 6:24-26; Ps. 31:17[16]; 67:2[1]; 80:4,8,20[3,7,19]; 119:135), while its absence elicits terror and confusion (Ps. 104:29, *tastîr pāneyḵā yibbāhēlûn;* cf. Ps. 30:8[7]). Even though one basically concedes God the freedom to "keep quiet" *(yašqîṭ)* and hide his face (who, after all, is permitted to reproach him for it? Job 34:29), still the (innocent) oppressed and persecuted petitioner does ask in his lament why God is hiding his face (from him) and why he, who is innocent, must be delivered over to distress. This is the case in Ps. 13:2(1) (an individual lament), where the parallels to God's hidden countenance include God's forgetting, the petitioner's own sorrow and grief, and the hostility of others (cf. Ps. 89:47[46] [niphal: Yahweh hides himself in burning wrath]; and Job 13:24, where the lamenting petitioner perceives Yahweh's self-withdrawal [again with *pānîm*] as a sign of God's hostility). In Ps. 44:25(24), a communal lament, the petitioners inquire not only "why" *(lāmmâ)* God has hidden his countenance but also why he has forgotten their afflictions. Yet another communal lament acknowledges in a confession of sin the justification for God's withdrawal (Isa. 64:6[7]; cf. 63:15–64:11[12]; cf. 59:2, "your sins have hidden his face [see *BHS*] from you so that he does not hear"). The penitent can even request that God hide his face from the sinner's transgressions

8. Concerning the dating of this passage, cf. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 26–45. WMANT* 52 (1981), 34, 49, 66 (post-Deuteronomistic); and W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (³1968), 199 (genuinely Jeremianic).

9. Concerning the various strata of the passage, see W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 283f., 319-21.

and blot out his sins (Ps. 51:11[9]). In the individual lament Ps. 88, the parallel line of the "why" question asks about the reason for being cast off (v. 15[14], *tiznaḥ napšî*). The psalmist asks Yahweh to hide his face no longer (27:9; 69:18[17]; 143:7) and to turn away all the distress and misfortune that this gesture means.

In this context the figure of speech regarding God's "hidden face" virtually comes to mean that God refuses to hear a person's prayer (Ps. 102:3[2]; cf. Isa. 59:2; Ps. 69:18[17] [cf. with v. 17(16)]; 143:7; formulated positively in 22:25[24], "for he did not despise or abhor the wailing [see *BHS*] of the poor; he did not hide his face from him, but heard when he cried to him"). Individual hymns of thanksgiving frequently portray the distress itself (30:8[7]: "you hid your face; I was dismayed"; cf. 104:29). In view of this expression's use in psalms of lament and thanksgiving, and considering the contrasting notions concerning the salvific and beneficent results when God's face is in fact not hidden, one might assume that the setting in life of this fixed formulation involved some worship context.

The blasphemer speculates (ultimately incorrectly) that God hides his face and does not see what the godless *(rāšā')* do, especially their repression of the poor and miserable. In any event, this is reason for lament (Ps. 10:11). Isaiah imposes the cry of woe on those who, apparently as political leaders of the people, believe that no one sees them, not even Yahweh, nor knows about them when "in the deep" they "hide their plan [*'ēṣâ*, i.e., their autonomous secret diplomacy] from Yahweh" (Isa. 29:15).

Yahweh's *str* activity includes other objects besides *pānîm*. He hides Baruch and Jeremiah from Jehoiakim (Jer. 36:26). The Servant of God feels that Yahweh has hidden (preserved) him in his quiver like an arrow, that he may later fulfill his calling (Isa. 49:2, par. *ḥb'* hiphil, "in the shadow of his hand he hid me"). The persecuted petitioner would like God to hide him in the shadow of his wings (Ps. 17:8), "in the covert of your countenance" (31:21[20], *b^e sēṯer pānêḵā*), i.e., in the security of God's presence. Because the parallel line mentions that God hides *(ṣpn)* those who trust in him in a booth or shelter *(sukkâ)* "from contentious tongues," one might think of the security and shelter one finds in the temple and in God's presence in the cult (cf. 27:5). In a general sense the petitioner wishes that God would hide him from the wicked and evildoers (64:3[2], *tastîrēnî min . . .*). Job's request is quite unusual: that God might conceal him in *š^e'ôl* "until your wrath is past," and then remember him and give him the opportunity to live again (Job 14:13, par. *ṣpn* hiphil). The person devoted to the law is concerned that Yahweh might hide his commandments from him (Ps. 119:19; *miṣwâ* replaces *pānîm*, and Yahweh's beneficent presence is guaranteed by the unhidden commandments). God's honor, freedom, and glory allow him to conceal things, while a king must search things out for the sake of his prestige (Prov. 25:2).

Very few passages include human beings as subjects. Isa. 16:3f. charges the Jerusalemites with sheltering and offering the rights of denizens to refugees and outcasts fleeing the catastrophe inflicted on Moab (*satt^e rî* and *h^e wî sēṯer;* the rest of the text is difficult).[10]

---

10. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1997), 103f., 141-45.

IV. Nominal Forms.

1. sēṯer *and* siṯrâ. The noun *sēṯer* contains all the functional and semantic peculiarities of *str.* It can mean "hiding place," "refuge," "security," "shelter," "covering," "something inaccessible/hidden," and is similarly construed with *min.* The parallel terms belong to the same roots as those accompanying the verb. The noun is often used without any theological background. For example, the dove "in the clefts of the rock, in the covert of the cliff" (Cant. 2:14), is the beloved whom the lover desires and for whom he yearns, but who is apparently still inaccessible. The hippopotamus is hidden "in the covert of the reeds and in the marsh" (Job 40:21). The adulterer draws the veil over his face (Job 24:15) to avoid being recognized. Jonathan advises David to stay hidden from Saul in "a secret place" (1 S. 19:2). Abigail comes down toward David "under the cover of the mountain" (1 S. 25:20, *b^e sēṯer hāhār*). Shelters must be strong enough to withstand being swept away by masses of water (Isa. 28:17b, here as a threat against the "notables" in Jerusalem and their unsuccessful policy, about which they continue to brag, v. 15; cf. also the par. *maḥsēh kāzāḇ*). During the time of salvation, the righteous king and his officials will be "a hiding place from the wind and a covert from the tempest" for their subjects (Isa. 32:2, *maḥbē'-rû(a)ḥ* and *sēṯer-zerem*).

The form *bassēṯer,* "in a hiding place," "under cover," has in some instances become a fixed adverb meaning "secretly." The legal regulations of Deuteronomy brand or curse sins committed in secret (Dt. 13:7[6], anyone who secretly entices another to apostasy from Yahweh; 27:15, anyone who secretly sets up an idol; 27:24, anyone "who strikes down a neighbor in secret"). The concrete illustration of this theme of curse involves a portrayal of the "pitiless abandonment to cruel enemies"[11] that adapts elements of prophetic proclamation, including the topos of secret cannibalism within a besieged city (Dt. 28:57). According to the royal pledge in Ps. 101:5, the sovereign pledges to silence anyone "who secretly slanders a neighbor." Wisdom knows that a tongue that speaks secretly *(l^e šôn sēṯer)* creates angry looks (Prov. 25:23).[12] Nathan's penitential discourse exposes David's secret adultery (2 S. 12:12). The Judean king interrogates Jeremiah secretly concerning Yahweh's word (Jer. 37:17) and swears secretly to protect Jeremiah's life (38:16). Gedaliah tragically fails to take seriously Johanan ben Kareah's secret advice (40:15). By contrast, Ehud's (deceitful) *d^e ḇar-sēṯer* to the Moabite king Eglon does indeed fulfill its purpose (Jgs. 3:19). Job condemns his friends because they have already secretly *(bassēṯer)* and prematurely taken God's side against him (Job 13:10). In his oath of purification, Job is able to confess that not even in secret has his heart been enticed (31:27).

The qualification "secretly" can be negatively or positively charged depending on the context. Prov. 21:14 is unclear in its assertion that *mattān bassēṯer* averts anger (secret gifts are apparently being juxtaposed with bribery). The woman "Folly" insists that "stolen water is sweet, and hidden bread *(leḥem s^e ṯārîm)* is pleasant" (Prov. 9:17).

---

11. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), 175.

12. Cf. in this regard F. Vattioni, "Ancora il vento del nord di Proverbi 25,23," *Bibl* 46 (1965) 213-16.

As an analogy to "stolen water," "bread of hiddenness [NRSV 'eaten in secret']" can only be meant negatively, namely, as illegally obtained bread. For Deutero-Isaiah, Yahweh does not speak in secret; from the very outset he has stated clearly what awaits the addressees (Isa. 45:19, *lō' basseṯer;* 48:16, with reference to Cyrus's emissaries). Both passages presuppose a negative understanding of *sēṯer.* Ps. 139:15 understands *sēṯer* in the sense of inaccessibility and mystery; here the petitioner knows that God has created him personally (par. *taḥtîyôṯ 'ereṣ;* M. Dahood understands *sēṯer* here to be a metaphor for Sheol as in Isa. 48:16).[13] No mystery, no secret, is hidden from Yahweh.

Finally, Yahweh himself is understood to be a *sēṯer,* a "refuge," "shelter," "place of security." Noteworthy confessional statements include *siṯrî umāginnî 'attâ* (Ps. 119:114) and *'attâ sēṯer lî* (32:7, par. *miṣṣar tiṣṣᵉrēnî*). The lamenting petitioner confidently flees *(ḥāsâ)* to the *sēṯer kᵉnāp̄êḵā* ("shelter of your wings," 61:5[4], par. "let me abide in your tent forever"; the cultic reference is unmistakable). Whoever is able "to live in the shelter *(sēṯer)* of the Most High and abide in the shadow of the Almighty" may confess to Yahweh, "my refuge *(maḥseh),* my fortress, my God, in whom I trust" (91:1).[14]

The only occurrence of *siṯrâ* is in the Song of Moses (Dt. 32:38), where it means "shelter" or "protection." This song, which is doubtless to be dated no earlier than the exilic period, ironically addresses the powerlessness of the idols, since *they* should have risen, offered aid, and functioned as shelters.

The word *sēṯer* also has its place in the portrayal of theophanic phenomena. Darkness is like the covering in which God hides, and "thick clouds dark with water" are like his canopy (Ps. 18:12[11]; 2 S.22:12 omits *sēṯer*). Yet this divine "hiding place" of clouds does not obscure God's view of what happens on earth, as Eliphaz says in his rebuke to Job (Job 22:14). The cultic-liturgical reflection of events in salvific history recalls how Yahweh hearkened "in/through the secret place of thunder" *(bᵉsēṯer ra'am)* to the people's cries of distress (Ps. 81:8[7], possibly an allusion to the Sinai events or to experiences of deliverance during the wilderness wanderings [in view of v. 9], at any rate to a theophany).

2. mistār, mistôr, *and* mastēr. The 10 occurrences of *mistār* do not add anything substantively to the semantic nuances of *sēṯer.* We find that *mistār* can similarly be used in both secular and theological contexts as well as adverbially (in the sense of "secretly"). Jeremiah must weep secretly for his people because they will inevitably be subject to Yahweh's judgment if they do not obey his word (Jer. 13:17, where *bᵉmistārîm* has incorrectly been understood as a faulty transmission of *bᵉmisrārîm* < *srr* or of *bᵉmisrāḇîm* < *srb,* "be obdurate, stubborn").[15] The innocent but persecuted petitioner laments that the wicked will secretly *(bammistārîm)* strangle him, apparently without ever being held accountable (Ps. 10:8), and in the process is like a lion that "lurks in se-

13. "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 344f.

14. Cf. Hugger, 147ff.

15. Cf. *BHS.*

cret *(bammistār)* in its covert," waiting for its prey (v. 9; cf. the reference in 17:12 to the "young lion lurking in ambush"). One lament bemoans the secret slander against the innocent (64:5[4]; the poisonous words of slanderers are arrows that have been shot in secret). The petitioner suffers a particularly concentrated form of such distress when he discovers that Yahweh himself is like a lion in hiding, waiting in ambush for him (Lam. 3:10).

The impossibility of hiding from Yahweh is a familiar theologoumenon (Jer. 23:24, *figura etymologica*). According to Jer. 49:10, Yahweh himself uncovers the hiding place in which Edom (Esau) thinks it can conceal itself.

The meaning of *mistār* in Hab. 3:14 is incomprehensible, though W. Rudolph is probably correct in viewing v. 14b as secondary and in thus having v. 15 follow v. 14a.[16] In content, v. 14b could fit well with v. 16b; or the verse segment might be a gloss deriving from the lament (cf. Ps. 10:9b). Finally, here, too, *bammistār* might conceivably function adverbially, insofar as the wicked (v. 13b) secretly considers devouring the poor.

The *maṭmunê mistārîm* in the Cyrus oracle (Isa. 45:3) that Yahweh gives to Cyrus are to be understood in a completely secular sense, and parallel the "riches hidden in secret places" whose capture is part of the inexorable victory campaign of the young Persian king.

The only occurrence of *mistôr* is in Isa. 4:6. Unfortunately, the entire passage is difficult to understand. Only the context allows a modest understanding of the climate accompanying this (presumably postexilic) salvific oracle. At Yahweh's behest a comprehensive nexus of shelter and protection against the devastating forces of history and nature will be set up on Zion (the parallel term here is *maḥseh*).[17]

In Isa. 53:3 the noun *mastēr* exhibits extremely pronounced verbal features ("the hiding of faces before him"), frequently prompting translations as a verbal clause (e.g., NRSV "as one from whom others hide their faces").

V. Qumran and LXX. The numerous occurrences of *str* in both verbal and nominal forms in the Qumran writings preserve the general semantic field of the OT word (cf. 11QT 54:20 with Dt. 13:7[6]; 11QT 66:4 as an explication of Dt. 22:25). Interestingly, the niphal and hiphil here are joined by occurrences of the qal (1QH 5:11,26; 8:10) with transitive meaning (5:11: *s*ᵉ*ṯartanî neḡeḏ b*ᵉ*nê 'āḏām*). The topos of "hiding one's face from" (hiphil + *min*) also occurs (CD 1:3; 2:8; 11QT 59:7), as well as the niphal ptcp. *nistārôṯ* (1QS 5:11; CD 3:14; 1QH 17:9, presumably also 17:22), with the "hidden things" (cf. 4Q508 2, 4 with Dt. 29:28[29]) being viewed in close association with the law, the "covenant," and the commandments. These are revealed in the study of and obedience to the law. Among the nouns only *sēṯer* seems to have been used (1QS 9:22, *b*ᵉ*rûaḥ hassēṯer,* "in a spirit of secrecy";[18] 1QH 8:18, waters that suddenly gush forth after being hidden in secret, *m*ᵉ*ḥubbā'îm bassēṯer*). In 1QH 8:10 *swtr* is probably used

16. Rudolph, *Micha — Nahum — Habakuk — Zephanja. KAT* XIII/3 (1975), in loc.
17. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), in loc.
18. E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, ²1971), 34, reads *hastēr.*

adverbially like the two following participles (niphal), and represents an abbreviated pual ptcp. ([m^e]*suttār*). In 4Q512 fr. 34, 5:3, the petitioner asks for forgiveness of hidden *(nstrwt)* sins (cf. Ps. 19:13[12]).

Finally, the LXX renders this group almost exclusively with the root *krýptein,* only 7 times with *skepázein.*

Wagner

עָב *'āḇ*

Contents: I. Meaning, Word Field, Etymology. II. Occurrences, Distribution. III. Secular Contexts: Imagery and Metaphors. IV. Theological Contexts. V. LXX. VI. Qumran.

I. Meaning, Word Field, Etymology. The OT attests a considerable number of words for "cloud," "fog," and similar phenomena. The most frequent are → עָנָן *'ānān* (87 times + *'ᵃnān* and *'ᵃnānâ* once each), *'āḇ* (30 times), → שַׁחַק *šaḥaq* (21 times), and → עֲרָפֶל *'ᵃrāpel* (15 times). Less frequent terms include *nāśî'* (4 times), *qîṭôr* (4 times), *ḥāzîz* (3 times), and *'ēḏ* (twice).

As a designation for cloud, *'āḇ* as a rule refers to dense rain clouds, and corresponds best to the meteorological terms *stratocumulus, cumulonimbus,* and *cumulus.*[1] The *'āḇ* shelters against the summer heat (Isa. 25:5), and is associated especially with powerful cloudbursts (Jgs. 5:4; 1 K. 18:44f.; Job 26:8; Ps. 77:18[Eng. v. 17]; Eccl. 11:3; Isa. 5:6) or with the spring rain (Prov. 16:15).[2]

Half of the occurrences attest *'āḇ* in the singular, the other half in the plural (13 times *'āḇîm,* "cloud accumulation,"[3] twice as *'āḇôṯ,* "individual clouds"). Twice the word occurs with the 3rd person masc. sg. suf. (Job 26:8; Ps. 18:13[12]). In 3 instances it is used in construct with another word to mean "cloud": *'āḇ he'ānān* (Ex. 19:9) and *'āḇê š^eḥāqîm* (2 S. 22:12 = Ps. 18:12[11]).

'āḇ. F. M. Cross Jr., *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Mass., 1973), 163-69; M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography IV," *Bibl* 47 (1966) 403-19, esp. 414ff.; G. Garbini, "Note linguistico-filologiche," *Henoch* 4 (1982) 163-73; B. Holmberg, "Herren och molnet i Gamla testamentet," *SEÅ* 48 (1983) 31-47; J. Jeremias, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung. WMANT* 10 (1965); J. Luzarraga, *Las tradiciones de la Nube en la Biblia y en el Judaísmo primitivo. AnBibl* 54 (1973); P. D. Miller Jr., *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel. HSM* 5 (1975); J. C. de Moor, "Cloud," *IDBSup,* 168f.; S. Mowinckel, "Drive and/or Ride in O.T.," *VT* 12 (1962) 278-99; L. Sabourin, "The Biblical Cloud: Terminology and Tradition," *BTB* 4 (1974) 290-312; R. B. Y. Scott, "Meteorological Phenomena and Terminology in the OT," *ZAW* 64 (1952) 11-25; L. I. J. Stadelmann, *The Hebrew Conception of the World. AnBibl* 39 (1970); E. F. Sutcliffe, "The Clouds as Water-Carriers in Hebrew Thought," *VT* 3 (1953) 99-103.

1. So de Moor.
2. Cf. Scott and Stadelmann.
3. D. Michel, *Grundlegung einer hebräischen Syntax* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1977), I, 51.

Jer. 4:29 is the only passage in which *'āb̲* means "thicket" (an Aramaism?).[4] In yet another passage, the grapheme *'āb̲* is used as an architectural designation, perhaps "passageway."[5] This actually presupposes the root *'bb,* whereas "cloud" and "thicket" involve *'wb* (cf. Arab. *ǵāba,* "be dark, covered"; Syr. *'āb̲ā',* "forest").[6] J. Luzarraga suggests that an original *'b/'p* was then variously expanded and developed.[7]

The word *'āb̲* is to be distinguished from *ªb̲ōṯ,* "rope, cord." For the pl. form *ªb̲ōṯîm* in Ezk. 19:11; 31:3,10,14, however, many read *'āb̲ôṯ,* "clouds"[8] (the LXX supports this reading in the last 3 passages with *nephélē*).

II. Occurrences, Distribution. Of the 30 occurrences of *'āb̲,* "cloud," only 3 are in prose texts (Ex. 19:9; 1 K. 18:44f.), the rest in poetic texts. Among words meaning "cloud," *'āb̲* is the most frequent in poetic texts; *'ānān* occurs 20 times in poetic texts, 67 times in prose; *šaḥaq* 21 times in poetic texts; and *ªrāp̲el* 11 times in poetic texts, 4 times in prose.

Very few occurrences of *'āb̲* are in the Pentateuch and historical books (once in the Pentateuch: Ex. 19:9; 5 times in the Deuteronomistic history: Jgs. 5:4; 2 S. 22:12; 23:4; 1 K. 18:44f.). Among the prophetic books, *'āb̲* occurs only in Isaiah (7 times), then 5 times in the Psalms and 12 in wisdom literature.

III. Secular Contexts: Imagery and Metaphors. In those occurrences where *'āb̲* exhibits no specifically theological features, it is generally used metaphorically. Only in isolated instances does it actually refer to the concrete meteorological phenomenon (1 K. 18:44f.).[9]

Various metaphorical references attach to *'āb̲.* On the one hand it can refer to something positive and pleasant. Clouds can, after all, bring the vivifying rains, and one can accordingly say that "his [the king's] favor is like the clouds that bring the spring rain" (Prov. 16:15). The judgment of the vineyard owner on the vineyard/Jerusalem means among other things that the clouds will "rain no more rain upon it" (Isa. 5:6). Clouds can also provide shade as shelter against the sun, and just as the heat is buffered by the shade of the clouds, so also is the victorious song of the ruthless (Isa. 25:5). On the other hand, *'āb̲* can refer to something negative. Clouds can block the sun and hinder its vivifying warmth. Nonetheless, in this sense a cloudless sky can acquire positive features. The God-fearing ruler "is like the light of morning, like the sun rising on a cloudless morning, gleaming from the rain on the grassy land" (2 S. 23:4). Eccl. 12:2 associates clouds with the "days of trouble" of advanced age, and in 11:4 they refer to disruptive and distracting elements: "Whoever ob-

---

4. Cf. *BDB,* s.v.
5. *HAL,* II, 773; M. Görg, "Zur Dekoration der Tempelsäulen (1 Kön 7,13-22)," *BN* 11 (1980) 10ff. (probably no etymological relation).
6. Concerning Ugar. *ǵb,* see L. R. Fisher, *RSP,* II, 134, 142.
7. Pp. 22f.
8. Cf. *BHS.*
9. Cf. Sutcliffe.

serves the wind will not sow; and whoever regards the clouds will not reap." Similar to *'ānān, 'āḇ* can occasionally refer to something fleeting and transient in both a positive and a negative sense. Yahweh sweeps away Israel's transgression like a cloud (Isa. 44:22). The suffering Job laments that his prosperity "has passed away like a cloud" (Job 30:15). Similarly, *'āḇ* can refer to something rapid and quick. In connection with Jerusalem's future glory, Isa. 60:8 asks, "who are these that fly like clouds, and like doves to their windows?"

In Isa. 18:4 the clear heat of summer and the "cloud of dew in the heat of harvest" evoke Yahweh's lofty repose, and at the same time allude to the harvest, i.e., to chastising judgment. Eccl. 11:3 adduces the clouds and their function as examples of the inescapable workings of natural laws: "When clouds are full, they empty rain on the earth" (concerning this notion, cf. also Isa. 55:10).

On occasion, *'āḇ* used parallel with "heaven" refers to something extraordinarily lofty. "Even though they mount up high as the heavens, and their head reaches to the clouds, they will perish" (Job 20:6). "I [the king of Babylon] will ascend to the tops of the clouds, I will make myself like the Most High" (Isa. 14:14).

IV. Theological Contexts. In statements concerning Yahweh's creative power and in theophany portrayals, *'āḇ* acquires theological significance.

1. *God's Wisdom and Creative Power.* In response to Job's insistence on his own righteousness, both God and his friends point out his paltriness and lack of comprehension in comparison with God's omnipotence and wisdom. In these vivid descriptions of the Creator's sovereignty, his power over the clouds is a frequent motif. "He binds up the waters in his thick clouds *('āḇ),* and the cloud *('ānān)* is not torn open by them" (Job 26:8). "He loads the thick cloud *('āḇ)* with moisture, the clouds *('ānān)* scatter his lightning" (37:11). "Do you know the balancings of the clouds, the wondrous works of the one whose knowledge is perfect?" (37:16). "Can you lift up your voice to the clouds, so that a flood of waters may cover you?" (38:34). "Can anyone understand the spreading of the clouds, the thunderings of his pavilion?" (36:29). Both *šaḥaq* and *'ānān* also frequently occur in such contexts; for example, Ps. 147:8 speaks of Yahweh's sovereignty over nature ("he covers the heavens with clouds").

2. *Theophanies.* Theophany portrayals consist basically of two elements. (1) God comes; (2) nature reacts. In the second element, storms with thunder, lightning, and rain play an important role (Jgs. 5:4f.; 2 S. 22:8-16 [par. Ps. 18:8-16(7-15)]; Ps. 77:17-20[16-19]; Isa. 19:1ff.; cf. Job 36:29-33). Clouds can have various functions here. Sometimes they gush forth in powerful rains (Jgs. 5:4; Ps. 77:18[17]). In Ps. 18:13(12) the clouds give way (*'āḇar;* 2 S. 22 reads [probably more correctly] *bā'ar,* "burn" = "radiate") before Yahweh's glory, and hailstones and coals of fire rain down. In the preceding verse God conceals himself in darkness and thick clouds (although the wording is different in 2 S. 22:12, the meaning is similar). See also Job 22:14. Incidentally, clouds function as characteristic expressions of God's revelation and

hiddenness in the Sinai and wilderness traditions as well.[10] Indeed, the epic description of the divine revelation at Sinai (cf. *ʿāḇ* in Ex. 19:9) can be viewed as a historicizing of the ancient theophany portrayals.[11]

The image of God in theophanies is usually that of the divine warrior.[12] Several of the motifs associated with the cloud derive from war, e.g., the cloud as God's chariot (Ps. 104:3f.; cf. Isa. 19:1) with the winds as his messengers *(mal'āḵîm)* or servants *mᵉšārᵉṯîm*). The lightning bolts coming from these clouds are Yahweh's arrows (2 S. 22:15 = Ps. 18:15[14]; Ps. 77:18[17]; Zec. 9:14). Although the original life setting of the theophany is to be found in the victory celebrations of the Israelite army, some connection may still obtain with the Jerusalem temple cult whereby the cloud might be associated with incense.[13]

The notion of the divine warrior is also associated with the expression *rōḵēḇ ʿal-ʿāḇ* ("who rides on a cloud," Isa. 19:1). Other passages, too, speak of Yahweh riding on the clouds (Dt. 33:26, *šaḥaq*) in the ancient heavens (Ps. 68:34[33]) or on a cherub (2 S. 22:11 = Ps. 18:11[10]). The most unequivocal statement in this context is Ps. 104:3: "He makes the clouds his chariot" (*haśśām ʿāḇîm rᵉḵûḇô;* cf. Jer. 4:13).

The expression *rōḵēḇ bāʿᵃrāḇôṯ* in Ps. 68:5(4) is disputed. It is usually associated with Ugar. *rkb ʿrpt,* "cloud rider," as an epithet of Baʿal (although "who rides through the steppes" is also contextually possible). It is worth noting that *rāḵaḇ* refers to driving a chariot rather than to riding a horse.[14]

Portrayals of the day of Yahweh are related to theophanies.[15] Here, too, the cloud reappears, although these texts do not use *ʿāḇ* but primarily *ʿānān* (Ezk. 30:3; Joel 2:2; Zeph. 1:15) and *ʿᵃrāp̱el* (Joel 2:2; Zeph. 1:15).

V. LXX. The LXX usually translates *ʿāḇ* as well as both *ʿānān* and *šaḥaq* with *nephélē* or *néphos.* By contrast, *ʿᵃrāp̱el* is as a rule rendered by *gnóphos,* and only in exceptional instances by *nephélē.* The most frequent rendering of cloud in the LXX is *nephélē,* with *néphos* used primarily in wisdom literature (of the 9 occurrences of *néphos* as the translation of *ʿāḇ,* 8 are in wisdom literature and one in the Psalms); *nephélē* is used 19 times, of which 4 are in wisdom literature. The LXX translates the expression *ʿāḇê šᵉḥāqîm* (2 S. 22:12 = Ps. 18:12[11]) as *nephélē aérōn,* and *ʿāḇ heʿānān* (Ex. 19:9) as *stýlos nephélēs,* "cloud pillar."

VI. Qumran. The use of *ʿāḇ* in the Qumran writings offers nothing new. Although the text of 1QM 10:12 is corrupt, the context involves the Creator's power and wisdom. 1QM 12:9f. is interesting in asserting that "the hero of war is with our congregation; the host of his spirits is with our foot soldiers, and our horsemen [are as] clouds

---

10. → עָנָן *ʿānān.*
11. → סִינַי *sînay;* see Cross.
12. See Miller.
13. For the former see Jeremias, 136-50; for the latter, Holmberg, 45f.
14. See Mowinckel.
15. → יוֹם *yôm* (VI, 7-32).

(ʿᵃnānîm), as clouds of dew *(ʿāḇê ṭal)* (covering) the earth, as a shower of rain shedding judgment on all that grows on the earth" (concerning *ʿāḇê ṭal,* cf. Isa. 18:4, here too in connection with judgment). The comparison of the riders with clouds recalls OT passages in which clouds and similar phenomena appear as divine messengers (Ex. 14:19; Job 37:12; 38:35; Ps. 104:3f.).

Holmberg

עָבַד *ʿāḇaḏ;* עֶבֶד *ʿeḇeḏ;* עֲבֹדָה *ᵃḇōḏâ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Cognates; 3. OT Usage; 4. LXX. II. The Verb *ʿāḇaḏ:* 1. Without Objects; 2. With *bᵉ;* 3. With Inanimate Objects; 4. *ʿāḇaḏ ʿᵃḇōḏâ;* 5. With Personal Objects; 6. Serving Yahweh and the Gods. III. The Substantive *ʿeḇeḏ:* 1. Slave; 2. Excursus: Slavery in Israel's Environs; 3. The Israelites in Egypt; 4. Vassals; 5. *ʿeḇeḏ* of the King; 6. Self-designation as an Expression of Obsequiousness; 7. Self-designation in the Psalms; 8. Servant of Yahweh; 9. Prophets as Yahweh's Servants; 10. *ʿeḇeḏ* in Deutero-Isaiah: a. The *ʿeḇeḏ* Israel; b. The Anonymous *ʿeḇeḏ;* c. The Identity of the Anonymous Servant. IV. *ʿᵃḇōḏâ:* 1. Work; 2. Cultic Service. V. Qumran. VI. Judaism.

ʿāḇaḏ. C. Barth, "Mose, Knecht Gottes," *Parrēsia. FS K. Barth* (Zurich, 1966), 68-81; W. W. Graf Baudissin, *Zur Entwicklung des Gebrauchs von ʿebed in religiösem Sinne. BZAW* 34 (1920), 1-9; W. Brandt, *Dienst und Dienen im NT. Neutestamentliche Forschungen* II/5 (1931); F. Coblenz, *Über das betende Ich des Psalters* (1896); J. P. Floss, *Jahwe dienen — Göttern dienen. BBB* 45 (1975); K. Galling, "Beschriftete Bildsiegel des ersten Jahrtausends v. Chr. vornehmlich aus Syrien und Palästina," *ZDPV* 64 (1941) 121-202; H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel* (Eng. trans., Richmond, 1966); I. Lande, *Formelhafte Wendungen der Umgangssprache im AT* (Leiden, 1949); C. Lindhagen, *The Servant Motif in the OT* (Uppsala, 1950); J. Milgrom, *Studies in Levitical Terminology* (Berkeley, 1970); J. P. M. van der Ploeg, "Slavery in the OT," *Congress Volume, Uppsala 1971. SVT* 22 (1972), 72-87; G. von Rad, "Das Werk Jahwes," *ThB* 48 (1973), 236-44; K.-H. Rengstorf, "δοῦλος," *TDNT,* II, 261-80; I. Riesener, *Der Stamm* עבד *im AT. BZAW* 149 (1979); U. Rüterswörden, *Die Beamten der israelitischen Königszeit. BWANT* 117 (1985); H. Strathmann, "λατρεύω," *TDNT,* IV, 58-65; idem, "λειτουργέω," *TDNT,* IV, 215-31; N. L. Tidwell, "My Servant Jacob, Is. xlii 1," *Studies on Prophecy. SVT* 26 (1974), 84-91; R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* esp. 80-90; Z. Zevit, "The Use of עֶבֶד as a Diplomatic Term in Jeremiah," *JBL* 88 (1969) 74-77; W. Zimmerli, "The עֶבֶד יְהוָה in the OT," *TDNT,* V, 656-73.

On III.2: A. el-M. Bakir, *Slavery in Pharaonic Egypt. ASAE Sup* 18 (Cairo, 1952); J. Klima, *Gesellschaft und Kultur des alten Mesopotamien* (Prague, 1964); I. Mendelsohn, *Slavery in the Ancient Near East* (New York, 1949); A. Y. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago, 1964), esp. 75ff.

On III.10: K. Baltzer, "Zur formgeschichtlichen Bestimmung der Teste vom Gottesknecht im Deuterojesaja-Buch," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 27-43; H. M. Barstad, "Tjenersangene hos Deuterojesaja," *NTT* 83 (1982) 235-44; J. Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja. BWANT* 77 (1938) = *ThB* 20 (1963); K. Budde, *Die sogenannten Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder und die Bedeutung des Knechtes Jahwes in Jes. 40–55. Ein Minoritätsvotum* (1900); H. Cazelles, "Les poèmes du Serviteur: Leur place, leur structure, leur théologie," *RSR* 43

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *'bd* occurs in most of the Semitic languages. It does, however, exhibit a measure of semantic diversity. On the one hand, Ugar. *'bd,* Heb. *'āḇaḏ,* Arab. *'abada,* and OSA *'bd* all mean "serve" (this group perhaps also includes

---

(1955) 5-51; E. W. Conrad, "The 'Fear Not' Oracles in Second Isaiah," *VT* 34 (1984) 129-52; J. Coppens, "La Mission du Serviteur de Yahwé et son statut eschatologique," *ETL* 48 (1972) 343-71; P.-E. Dion, "Les chants du Serviteur de Yahweh et quelques passages apparentés d'Is 40–55," *Bibl* 51 (1970) 17-38; O. Eissfeldt, *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja (Jes. 40–55) im Lichte der israelitischen Anschauung von Gemeinschaft und Individuum. BRA* 2 (1933); I. Engnell, "The 'Ebed Yahweh Songs and the Suffering Messiah in 'Deutero-Isaiah,'" *BJRL* 31 (1948) 54-93; N. Füglister, "Kirche als Knecht Gottes und der Menschen," *BiKi* 39 (1984) 109-22; G. Gerleman, *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie* (Heidelberg, 1980), esp. 38-60; P. Grelot, *Les poèmes du serviteur; de la lecture critique à l'herméneutique. LD* 103 (1981); H. Gressmann, *Der Messias. FRLANT* 26[43] (1929); E. Haag, "Die Botschaft vom Gottesknecht: Ein Weg zur Überwindung der Gewalt," *Gewalt und Gewaltlosigkiet im AT,* ed. N. Lohfink, *QD* 96 (1981), 159-213; H. Haag, *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja. EdF* 233 (1985); H.-J. Hermisson, "Der Lohn des Knechts," *Die Botschaft und die Boten. FS H. W. Wolff,* ed. J. Jeremias and L. Perlitt (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1981), 269-87; idem, "Israel und der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja," *ZTK* 79 (1982) 1-24; idem, "Voreiliger Abschied von den Gottesknechtliedern," *TRu* 49 (1984) 209-22; J. A. Hyatt, "The Sources of the Suffering Servant Idea," *JNES* 3 (1944) 79-86; O. Kaiser, *Der königliche Knecht. FRLANT* 70 (1959; ²1962); A. S. Kapelrud, "The Identity of the Suffering Servant," *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W. F. Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), 307-14; idem, "Second Isaiah and the Suffering Servant," *Hommages à A. Dupont-Sommer* (Paris, 1971), 297-303; J. Lindblom, *The Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah. LUÅ* 47/5 (1951); R. P. Merendino, *Der Erste und der Letzte: Eine Untersuchung von Jes 40–48. SVT* 31 (1981); T. N. D. Mettinger, *A Farewell to the Servant Songs: A Critical Examination of an Exegetical Axiom* (Lund, 1983); idem, "Die Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder: Ein fragwürdiges Axiom," *ASTI* 11 (1977/78) 68-76; K. Nakazawa, "The Servant Songs: A Review after Three Decades," *Orient* 18 (1982) 65-82; C. R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* (Oxford/London, ²1956); H. M. Orlinsky, "The So-called 'Servant of the Lord' and 'Suffering Servant' in Second Isaiah," Orlinsky and N. H. Snaith, *Studies in the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah. SVT* 14 (1967), 1-133 (cf. *The So-called "Suffering Servant" in Isaiah 53* [Cincinnati, 1964]); A. Richter, Hauptlinien der Deuterojesaja-Forschung von 1964-1979," in C. Westermann, *Sprache und Struktur der Prophetie Deuterojesajas. CThM* 11 (1981), 89-131; H. Ringgren, *The Messiah in the OT. SBT* 1/18 (1956), esp. 54-67; L. Ruppert, "Der leidende Gottesknecht," *Concilium* 12 (Einsiedeln, 1976) 571-75; E. Ruprecht, "Die Auslegungsgeschichte zu den sog. Gottesknechtliedern im Buche Deuterojesaja unter methodischen Gesichtspunkten bis zu Bernhard Duhm" (diss., Heidelberg, 1972); R. Schwager, *Brauchen wir einen Sündenbock?* (Munich, 1978), 134-42; A. Schoors, *I Am God Your Saviour: A Form-Critical Study of the Main Genres in Is XL–LV. SVT* 24 (1973); O. H. Steck, "Aspekte des Gottesknechts in Deuterojesajas 'Ebed-Jahwe-Liedern,'" *ZAW* 96 (1984) 372-90; J. M. Vincent, *Studien zur literarischen Eigenart und zur geistigen Heimat von Jesaja, Kap. 40–55. BET* 5 (1977); C. Westermann, *Sprache und Struktur der Prophetie Deuterojesajas. ThB* 24 (1964), 92-170; L. E. Wilshire, "The Servant City: A New Interpretation of the 'Servant of the Lord' in the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah," *JBL* 94 (1975) 356-67.

On Isa. 42:1-7: J. M. Bernal Giménez, "El Siervo como promesa de *mišpāṭ:* estudio biblico del término *mišpāṭ* en Is 42,1-4," *Palabra y vida. FS J. Alonso Diaz. Miscelánea Comillas* 41 (1983), 77-85; W. A. M. Beuken, "*Mišpāṭ:* The First Servant Song and Its Context," *VT* 22 (1972) 1-30; F. Frezza, "Annotazioni sperimentali su Is 42,1-4," *RivB* 19 (1971) 307-20; D. R. Hillers, "*Bĕrît 'ām:* 'Emancipation of the People,'" *JBL* 97 (1978) 175-82; J. Jeremias, "*mišpāṭ*

Eth. *'abaṭa,* "impose compulsory labor," though cf. OSA *'bt,* "exaction, compulsion");[1] on the other hand, Aram., Syr. *'aḇaḏ* and Phoen. *'bd* mean "do, make." By contrast, the subst. *'eḇeḏ,* Ugar. *'bd,* Phoen. *'bd,* Aram. *'aḇdā',* Arab. *'abd,* and OSA *'bd* consistently mean "slave, servant," though the noun is absent in Ethiopic and appears in Akkadian only as the loanword *abdu;* the genuine Akkadian word is *(w)ardu.*[2]

---

im ersten Gottesknechtslied (Jes 42,1-4)," *VT* 22 (1972) 31-42; J. Koenig, "L'allusion inexpliquée au roseau et à la mèche (Isaïe XLII 3)," *VT* 18 (1968) 159-72; A. Lauha, "'Der Bund des Volkes.' Ein Aspekt der deuterojesajanischen Missionstheologie," *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. FS W. Zimmerli* (Göttingen, 1977), 257-61; R. Marcus, "The 'Plain Meaning' of Isaiah 42,1-4," *HTR* 30 (1937) 249-59; F. V. Reiterer, "Das geknickte Rohr zerbricht er nicht," *HD* 35 (1981) 162-80; H. Simian-Yofre, "'Manifesterá su destino ante las naciones' (Is 42,1b)," *Simposio Biblico Español* (Madrid, 1984), 309-24; J. J. Stamm, "*Berit 'am* bei Deuterojesaja," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 510-24; M. Wada, "Reconsideration of *mišpāṭ* in Isaiah 42,1-4," *Seisho-Gaku Ronschū* 16 (1981) 46-79; cf. *OT Abstracts* 5 (1982) 168.

On Isa. 43:8-13: H. Simian-Yofre, "Testigo y servidor," *II Simposio Biblico Español (Cordoba, 1985)* (Valencia/Cordoba, 1987), 255-64.

On Isa. 49:1-7: N. Lohfink, "'Israel' in Jes 49,3," *Wort, Lied, und Gottesspruch. FS J. Ziegler,* 2 vols. *FzB* 2 (1972), II, 217-29; R. P. Merendino, "Jes 49,7-13: Jahwes Bekenntnis zu Israels Land," *Henoch* 4 (1982) 295-329.

On Isa. 50:4-9a: R. P. Merendino, "Allein und einzig Gottes prophetisches Wort: Israels Erbe und Auftrag für alle Zukunft (Jesaja 50,4-9a.10)," *ZAW* 97 (1985) 344-66.

On Isa. 52:13–53:12: D. J. A. Clines, *I, He, We and They: A Literary Approach to Isaiah 53. JSOTSup* 1 (Sheffield, 1976); M. Dahood, "Phoenician Elements in Isaiah 52:13–53:12," *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of W. F. Albright* (Baltimore, 1971), 63-73; idem, "Isaiah 53,8-12 and Massoretic Misconstructions," *Bibl* 63 (1982) 566-70; J. Day, "*Da'aṯ* 'Humiliation' in Isaiah 53 in the Light of Isaiah 53:3 and Daniel 12:4 and the Oldest Known Interpretation of the Suffering Servant," *VT* 30 (1980) 97-103; K. Elliger, "Nochmals Textkritisches zu Jes 53," *Wort, Lied, und Gottesspruch. FS J. Ziegler,* 2 vols. FzB 2 (1972), II, 137-44; G. Fohrer, "Stellvertretung und Schuldopfer in Jes 52,13–53,12," *Studien zu alttestamentlichen Texten und Themen (1966-72). BZAW* 155 (1981), 24-43; E. Haag, "Das Opfer des Gottesknechts (Jes 53,10)," *TTZ* 86 (1977) 81-98; E. Kutsch, *Sein Leiden und Tod — Unser Heil: Eine Exegese von Jes 52,13–53,12. BSt* 52 (1967); R. Martin-Achard, "Trois études sur Isaïe 53," *RTP* 114 (1982) 159-70; D. F. Payne, "Recent Trends in the Study of Isaiah 53," *Irish Biblical Studies* 1 (1979) 3-18; F. V. Reiterer, "Stellvertretung, Leid, Jenseitshoffnung: Die Botschaft des vierten Gottesknechtsliedes (Jes 52,13–53,12)," *HD* 36 (1982) 12-32; L. G. Rignell, "Isa. lii 13–liii 12," *VT* 3 (1953) 87-92; L. Ruppert, "Schuld und Schuld-Lösen nach Jesaja 53," *Schulderfahrung und Schuldbewältigung,* ed. G. Kaufmann, *Schriften zur Pädagogik und Katechetik* 31 (1982), 17-34; J. A. Soggin, "Tod und Auferstehung des leidenden Gottesknechtes Jes 53,8-10," *ZAW* 87 (1975) 346-55; O. H. Steck, "Aspekte des Gottesknechts in Jes 52,13–53,12," *ZAW* 97 (1985) 36-58; T. C. Vriezen, "The Term *hizza:* Lustration and Consecration," *OTS* 7 (1950) 201-35; R. N. Whybray, *Thanksgiving for a Liberated Prophet: An Interpretation of Isaiah Chapter 53. JSOTSup* 4 (1978) (cf. the review by H.-J. Hermisson, *TLZ* 106 [1981] 802-4); W. Zimmerli, "Zur Vorgeschichte von Jes 53," *Congress Volume, Rome 1968. SVT* 17 (1969), 236-44.

1. Biella, 350.
2. *AHw,* III, 1464f.

2. *Cognates.* a. *Ugarit.* As already mentioned, Ugar. *'bd* means "serve": "serve the Aliyan Ba'al," par. *s'd,* "honor, venerate as lord," otherwise par. to *kbd* (the context is not entirely clear, and the following lines seem to suggest the meaning "serve").[3] The subst. *'bd* occurs numerous times. The expression *'bd 'lm* (cf. Heb. *'eḇeḏ 'ôlām,* Dt. 15:17; 1 S. 27:12; Job 40:28[Eng. 41:4]) is usually construed as "slave for life," though some think the reference is to some sort of vassal relationship.[4] One list of vocations includes *'bdm* together with *n'rm,* "servants," *kzym,* "charioteers," etc.[5] Another list includes them together with *kbśm,* "fullers, felters."[6] One list of deliveries for a construction site mentions a *bt 'bdm,* "[a door for] the slave quarters."[7] The *'bd mlk* is probably a royal official.[8] The word's special semantic nuances are expressed by using it together with *sglt,* "possession," and *ml'k,* "messenger."[9] The word is also associated with a document of release *(spr tbrrt)* for a slave.[10] In letters *'bdk,* "your servant," as a self-designation of the sender corresponds to *mlk,* "king," or *mlkt,* "queen," and *'dt,* "mistress," for the recipient.[11]

In connection with the temple construction for Ba'al, Luṭpan asks: "Shall I be an *'bd* of Athirat, shall I be an *'bd* who busies himself with the trowel?"[12] An *'bd* can thus be a mason. When Yamm defeats Ba'al, El says to him: "Your *'bd* (slave, subject) is Ba'al, O Yamm, your slave is Ba'al forever, Dagon's son is your *'sr* (captive? bondsman?)."[13] When Ba'al is overcome by Mot, he capitulates with the words, "your slave I, your bondman forever *(d'lmk).*"[14] That is, an *'bd* is a person who is subject to someone stronger. Keret is called *'bd 'l,* "servant of El."[15] Similarly, of Danel it is said that "El takes his servant, blessing Danel . . . strengthening [*mr,* also 'blessing'] the hero."[16] This seems to be a fixed expression referring to the close relationship between God and the king.

A great many personal names refer to their bearers as "servants" of a specific god.[17]

b. *Old South Arabic.* The OSA term *'bd* seems to mean "subjugate, enslave," and in

3. *KTU,* 1.3, I, 2.

4. F. C. Fensham, "Notes on Treaty Terminology in Ugaritic Epics," *UF* 11 (1979) 269.

5. *KTU,* 4.126, 11, 12; → נער *na'ar.*

6. *KTU,* 4.71, III, 5. Concerning *'bdm* as the designation for a guild or corporation, cf. T. Yamashita, *RSP,* II, 66f., no. 32.

7. *KTU,* 4.195, 9.

8. *KTU,* 2.45, 14.

9. For the former see *KTU,* 2.39, 7; cf. M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 341. For the latter see *KTU,* 1.14, 137, 138; cf. 2.23, 3.

10. *KTU,* 2.19, 9f.; cf. 2.12; 2.11.

11. With *mlk* see *KTU,* 2.33, 2; cf. 1.49, 15. With *'dt* see *KTU,* 2.16, 4.

12. *KTU,* 1.4, IV, 59f.

13. *KTU,* 1.2, I, 36f.; *ANET,* 130.

14. *KTU,* 1.5, II, 12; *ANET,* 138.

15. *KTU,* 1.14, III, 49, 51; VI, 34f.; *ANET,* 144, 145 (n. 6 on 143: "This epithet [Lad of El], like 'Servant of El,' has the connotations of 'favorite' and 'intimate'; cf. Nu. 12:6-9; Deut. 34:5-10; Isa. 41:8; etc.").

16. *KTU,* 1.17, I, 34f.; *ANET,* 150.

17. *PNU,* 80, 105.

the *t-* form "subjugate oneself." The subst. *'bd* clearly means "slave." Occurrences include "whoever buys a male or female slave (*'mt*)," "the children and community of Almaqah, his freemen (*ḥr*) and his slaves." It can also refer to a person as the "servant" of a particular god ("may Almaqah grant his servants happiness") or as the subject of a king.[18] All meanings use *'dm* as the plural form (cf. Heb. *'āḏām*).[19]

c. *Akkadian.* The Akk. term *(w)ardu* exhibits a broad semantic spectrum. It can refer to the unfree slave (prisoner of war, purchased, one who can be set free),[20] to the subject of a king and others, and to the "royal servant" as an official. It is used in letters and prayers as a devoted self-designation, and can refer to people as servants of gods (also as a royal epithet).[21]

d. *Amarna Letters.* In the Amarna letters the person sending the letter often refers to himself as the *ardu* of the pharaoh, of his lord (*bēlu*), often underscoring his obsequiousness with expressions such as "the dust beneath your feet, the ground upon which you walk."[22] In the corpus of the letter, he calls himself *aradka,* "your servant," "your loyal servant," etc.[23] Both the term *ardu* and the denominated verb *arādu,* "serve," express the subjugation and loyalty of the letter writer. He hears and obeys; he takes the king's yoke on himself; the king can do with him what he will, etc.[24] One letter from Abimilki is especially characteristic:

> As for him who hearkens to the king, his lord, and serves him in his place, the Sun-god shall rise over him, and the sweet breath from the mouth of his lord shall give him life; but as for him who hearkens not to the word of the king, his lord, his city shall perish, his dynasty shall perish, his name shall not exist in the whole land forever. Behold, the servant who hearkens to his lord, it shall be well with his city, it shall be well with his house; his name shall exist forever.[25]

e. *Phoenician and Aramaic Inscriptions.* Among the inscriptional evidence for the verb, only the Phoenician witnesses are of value, since Aram. *'bd* means "do, make." In three instances the Karatepe inscription mentions persons subject or not subject to King Azitawadda and his house of *mpš.*[26] Both Phoenician and Punic inscriptions attest multiple occurrences of the subst. *'bd,* which here usually refers to the servants of a particular god. King Azitawadda is the servant of Ba'al, the citizens of *Ḥmn* are servants of Milk-Astart, as are those of Cadiz.[27] A certain *'bd'sr* is the servant of Melqart; Harpokrates should grant life to his servant 'Abd-Eshmun.[28] Nonetheless, an inscrip-

18. Documentation in Biella, 349.
19. Ibid., 5.
20. See III.2 below.
21. See III.6 below; cf. Seux, 360-63.
22. Lindhagen, 13-17.
23. Ibid., 17ff.
24. Ibid., 22ff.
25. *VAB,* II, 147, 41-51; Lindhagen, 25; translation according to *ANET,* 484.
26. *KAI,* 26A, I, 15; A, III, 10; C, IV, 11; *ANET,* 653f.
27. On the first, see *KAI,* 26A, I, 1; *ANET,* 653; on the second, *KAI,* 19:3; on the third, *KAI,* 71:2.
28. *KAI,* 47:2; 52:2.

tion from Cyprus mentions a governor as the servant of the King *Ḥrm* of Sidon,[29] and one from Carthage a servant of Eshmunʿazar.

One Aramaic inscription describes King Barrakib of Sam'al as an *'bd* of Tiglath-pileser,[30] probably referring to a vassal relationship. In one of the Sefire inscriptions, Barga'yah stipulates that his contractual partner destroy anyone who might attack him, even if that person be "one of my brothers or one of my slaves (*'bd;* in a similar list, l. 10 mentions *ngr,* 'officials') or one of my officials *(pqd)* or one of the people under my control."[31] The Ashur Ostracon contains the sentence, "they are slaves, those who are mine *('bdn zly);* they have escaped(?)."[32] Those who have fled are apparently slaves in the literal sense (cf. l. 7: "My lord, the king, gave them to me").[33]

3. *OT Usage.* The verb *'āḇaḏ* occurs 271 times in the qal; of the remaining forms, the niphal occurs 4 times, the pual twice, the hiphil 8 times, and the hophal 4 times (though some questions remain; see below). Of the nouns, *'eḇeḏ* occurs 805 times, *ᵃḇōḏâ* 145 times. The weak showing in the Psalms and prophetic books is striking. With the exception of Jeremiah (36 occurrences), the verb occurs only 27 times in the prophetic books, 8 times in the Psalms, 3 times in Job, and twice each in Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. Similarly, *'eḇeḏ* is only sparsely attested in prophetic literature (the exceptions being Isaiah with 40 occurrences and Jeremiah with 32). Here the Psalms constitute an exception with 57 occurrences, including the self-designation *'aḇdᵉḵā.*[34]

Nouns with 3 occurrences each include *'aḇdûṯ,* "slavery" (Ezr. 9:8f.; Neh. 9:17), and *ᵃḇuddâ,* "servants" (Gen. 26:14; Job 1:3; conj. Ps. 104:14).

Among the personal names that include the root *'bd* are *'eḇeḏ-meleḵ, 'aḇdᵉ'ēl, 'aḇdî'ēl, 'aḇdî, 'aḇdā', 'ōḇēḏ 'ᵉḏōm, 'aḇdôn* (also a place-name), *'ōḇaḏyâ,* and Aram. *ᵃḇēḏ-nᵉgô.*[35]

4. *LXX.* In rendering *'āḇaḏ* in the qal, the LXX usually uses *douleúein* (114 times) or *latreúein* (75 times), though also *ergázesthai* (37 times), *leitourgeín* (13 times), and in isolated instances other verbs as well. The other stem forms are translated commensurate with these choices. The LXX renders *'eḇeḏ* with *doúlos* (314 times), *país* (336 times), and *therápōn* (42 times), and *ᵃḇōḏâ* usually with *leitourgeía* or *érgon,* though also with *douleía, ergasía,* and *latreía.*

II. The Verb *'āḇaḏ.*

1. *Without Objects.* Without an object, *'āḇaḏ* usually means "to work." In the sab-

---

29. *KAI,* 31:1.
30. *KAI,* 216:3; 217:4.
31. *KAI,* 224:13; *ANET,* 661.
32. *KAI,* 233:13.
33. Concerning Phoenician and Aramaic PNs with *'bd* see *KAI,* III, 50f., 55; concerning Amorite PNs see *APNM,* 189.
34. Concerning the remaining distribution patterns, see Riesener, 107f.
35. See also *IPN,* 91; Riesener, 13ff.

bath commandment (Ex. 20:8ff.; Dt. 5:12ff.), for example, it is qualified more closely by *ʿāśâ kol-m^e^lāʾḵâ,* "do all kinds of business" (vv. 9f.,13f.). Its contrasting expression is then *šāḇaṯ,* "cease, celebrate."[36] In the shorter sabbath commandment in Ex. 34:21, *ʿāḇaḏ* seems to refer particularly to agricultural work.[37] Ex. 21:2 is concerned with the work of slaves, and Ex. 5:18 with the harsh work of making bricks. Although Eccl. 5:11(12) does not specify the work, the expression "sweet sleep" and the contrast with the "rich" do suggest that the focus is on hard work.[38] Ex. 1:13 and 6:5 use the hiphil form to render the idea of imposing hard work on someone; cf. also 2 Ch. 2:17(18).[39]

Job 36:11 is uncertain: "If they listen, and *ʿbd,* they complete their days in prosperity." This is usually translated as "serve him [God]" (so NRSV). It may be possible to understand *ʿbd* absolutely here as "to do," i.e., obey. A similar case occurs in Isa. 19:23, which announces that in the future both Egypt and Assyria will *ʿbd,* which probably means "serve [Yahweh]." The versions, however, translate "Egypt will serve Assyria." In Jer. 2:20 *lōʾ ʾeʿeḇōḏ* means something to the effect "I will be free" (NRSV "I will not serve"). Israel's "freedom," however, is deceptive, since they will become dependent on the baʿals.

In Isa. 43:23f. this usage acquires theological significance. Yahweh has not "made Israel work" (i.e., burdened Israel) with imposed offerings. By contrast, Israel has indeed burdened Yahweh with their sins (par. *ygʿ* hiphil; note the wordplay).

2. *With b^e^.* In the sense of "work, serve," *ʿāḇaḏ* occurs 6 times with the *b^e^ pretii,* which indicates the price for which a person works. Jacob works "for Rachel" (Gen. 29:18,20,25; cf. 30:26; 31:41, and the allusion in Hos. 12:13[12]: "Israel worked for a wife"). Nebuchadnezzar receives Egypt as compensation, "for which he labored" (Ezk. 29:20), i.e., Nebuchadnezzar carries out Yahweh's work and is rewarded with his victory over Egypt. A comparable expression is *ʿāḇaḏ ḥinnām,* "work (serve) for nothing" (Gen. 29:15; Jer. 22:13).

In other cases the prep. *b^e^ instrumentale* acquires significance. As a rule, the expression "carry out work through someone" means "make that person work" (Ex. 1:14; Lev. 25:39,46; Dt. 15:19; 21:3 [pual]; Isa. 14:3 [pual]; Jer. 22:13; 25:14; 27:7; 30:8; 34:9f.; Ezk. 34:27). The question is whether this is not a construction comparable to Arab. *bāʾ at-taʿdiya* or "transitivizing *bi.*"[40] The expression *ʿāḇaḏ b^e^* is indeed semantically equivalent to the hiphil *heʿeḇîḏ.*[41]

3. *With Inanimate Objects.* With inanimate objects, *ʿāḇaḏ* means to "work on, develop, cultivate," and its object is usually *ʾ^a^ḏāmâ.* After Adam is no longer allowed to work (till; *ʿāḇaḏ*) and keep *(šmr)* the garden (Gen. 2:15), he must till the ground with

36. Floss, 12.
37. Riesener, 112 n. 1.
38. Floss, 12f.
39. Concerning *mas ʿōḇēḏ,* → מס *mas* (VIII, 427-30).
40. S. Reckendorf, *Arabische Syntax* (Heidelberg, 1921, repr. 1977), §129.4.
41. Lindhagen, 51 n. 4; cf. Floss, 23f.

great effort (3:23). The curse against Cain is that when he tills the ground, it will no longer yield its fruit to him (4:12). The expression *ʿōḇēḏ ʾᵃḏāmâ* means "farmer" (4:2, the opposite being the shepherd; Zec. 13:5, the opposite being the *nāḇîʾ*; Prov. 12:11 par. 28:19; the last two passages praise the farmer in comparison to those "who follow worthless pursuits"). Other inanimate objects include vineyards (Dt. 28:39, par. "plant," *nāṭaʿ*) and flax (Isa. 19:9). The expression *ʿōḇēḏ hāʿîr* in Ezk. 48:18f. is probably modeled after *ʿōḇēḏ ʾᵃḏāmâ* and means "inhabitant of the city, one who works in the city," not "worker of the city." The content of Eccl. 5:8(9), "a king for a plowed [niphal] field," is obscure; the only thing that is clear is that this involves some advantage.

4. *ʿāḇaḏ ʿᵃḇōḏâ*. The *figura etymologica ʿāḇaḏ ʿᵃḇōḏâ* can refer to the performance of some secular service (Gen. 29:27; Lev. 25:39; Ezk. 29:18), though more frequently it refers to the performance of certain cultic acts, for example, the presentation of an offering (Josh. 22:27), the adherence to certain customs (Ex. 13:5, the Passover celebration), or the various activities at the tent of meeting (e.g., Nu. 3:8; 4:23,27; 7:5; 8:22).[42]

Isa. 28:21 merits special attention here. It uses *ʿāḇaḏ ʿᵃḇōḏâ* parallel with *ʿāśâ maʿᵃśeh,* then characterizes the two substantives with *nokrîyâ* and *zār.* Yahweh intends to perform "his strange work, his *opus alienum,*"[43] namely, of the sort he performed earlier at Mt. Perazim (2 S. 5:17ff.) and at Gibeon (Josh. 10:9ff. or 1 Ch. 14:16 = 2 S. 5:25, where the two locales are juxtaposed) when he destroyed his enemies. This time, however, his actions will be directed against his own people. It is an incongruous piece of work, an *opus alienum,* that is not commensurate with Yahweh's essence and is alien to him.

5. *With Personal Objects.* With personal objects *ʿāḇaḏ* means "serve" and expresses the relationship between an *ʿeḇeḏ* and his or her *ʾāḏôn,* "lord, master." This relationship can take on various forms itself. It can be one of subjugation and dependence, of total claim on a person, or of loyalty. Indeed, all these nuances resonate, with one or another feature being more or less emphasized in any given case. The dependency can be legal-social, as when a slave serves a master (Ex. 21:6), or political, as when a vassal serves a lord (2 K. 18:7).[44]

The Hebrew → עִבְרִי *ʿiḇrî,* "slave," serves his master his entire life (Ex. 21:6) or for a specified length of time (Dt. 15:12,18; Jer. 34:14). Jacob serves Laban (Gen. 29:15,30; 30:26,29; 31:6,41), and his compensation (the daughters) is indicated with *bᵉ*.[45] A son can "serve" his father (Mal. 3:17). Hushai wants to serve Absalom as he earlier served his father David (2 S. 16:19), an example of maintaining one's allegiance.[46] Even an animal can serve (Job 39:9, domesticated animals; wild animals are different).

---

42. Cf. Milgrom, *Levitical Terminology,* 60; Floss, 19.
43. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 255.
44. Cf. Floss, 24ff.; Riesener, 112ff.; Lindhagen, 62-71.
45. See II.2 above.
46. Floss, 26.

A true vassal relationship is reflected in Gen. 14:4 (five kings serve Chedorlaomer) and 2 K. 18:7 (Hezekiah will not serve the king of Assyria). In both cases the contrasting term is → מרד *māraḏ*, "revolt, rebel." Such service also included paying tribute (*minḥâ*, 2 S. 8:2,6 par. 1 Ch. 18:2,6). In other instances, *ʿāḇaḏ* refers in a completely general fashion to the dependent relationship between one or several nations and a king or another nation (Jgs. 3:8, Israel serves the king of Aram; 3:14, the king of Moab; 9:28, the Shechemites are to serve Abimelech; cf. v. 38). The oracle in Gen. 25:23 presupposes the dependency of Edom on Israel ("the elder shall serve the younger"), and the patriarchal blessing to Jacob promises him that nations will serve him (be subject to him) and nations will bow down to him (*hištaḥ^awâ*, Gen. 27:29). 1 S. 4:9 and 17:9 also involve the political dependency of one nation on another, whereas Gen. 15:13f. and Ex. 14:5,12 are probably evoking the memory of slavery in Egypt.

This usage recurs in two royal psalms. In 2 S. 22:44 = Ps. 18:44(43), David becomes the head (*rōʾš*) of nations, who then serve him. Ps. 72:11 asks, "may all kings fall down before him [*hištaḥ^awâ*], all nations give him service." See also the idealizing statement in 1 K. 5:1(4:21), according to which all the kingdoms from the Euphrates to the border with Egypt brought gifts (tribute) to Solomon and served him. This brings to expression the Israelite king's claims to world dominion.

Jeremiah often predicts the dependency of Judah or of other nations on the king of Babylon (Jer. 25:11; 27:6,7,8,9,11,12,13,14,17; 28:14; cf. 40:9 par. 2 K. 25:24). Both Dt. 28:48 and Jer. 5:19 portray the "serving" of foreign nations as the result of Israel having neglected to serve Yahweh, and in Jer. 17:4 Yahweh in his wrath makes Judah "serve" (hiphil) their enemies. According to the law of war in Dt. 20:11, the inhabitants of a besieged city that capitulates are to be made into forced laborers to "serve" (be subject to) the victor. According to 1 S. 11:1, when Nahash the Ammonite besieges Jabesh-gilead, its citizens offer to serve him, and in 2 S. 10:19 par. 1 Ch. 19:19, the kings dependent on Hadadezer offer peace to David and agree to serve him.

The use of *ʿāḇaḏ* acquires a unique coloring in the account of the division of the kingdom (1 K. 12:1-19). The representatives of the northern tribes demand to be freed from the yoke (*ʿōl*) and work (*ʿ^aḇōḏâ*) Solomon has imposed on them. Then they are prepared to "serve" Rehoboam (v. 4). When Rehoboam consults with the elders, however, he receives the answer: "If you will be a servant (*ʿeḇeḏ*) to this people today and serve (*ʿāḇaḏ*) them . . . then they will be your servants forever." As is well known, he does not follow this advice. Here *ʿāḇaḏ* refers to a relationship of mutual loyalty that the Chronicler finds offensive; he thus changes the king's serving into "being good."[47]

6. *Serving Yahweh and the Gods.* Of course, passages in which *ʿāḇaḏ* takes Yahweh or "other gods" or "foreign gods" as its object are of particular theological interest.

a. The first category includes passages implying cultic service. At his calling, Moses is charged with leading the people out of Egypt that they might "serve God on this

47. Concerning this whole section, cf. Floss 24-32; Riesener, 142-49.

mountain" (Ex. 3:12), a statement recalled many times during subsequent events (4:23; 7:16,26[8:1]; 8:16[20]; 9:1,13; 10:3,7,8,11,24,26; 12:31). The cultic reference is secured by the parallel words used in similar contexts, including *ḥgg,* "celebrate a festival" (5:1; cf. 10:9), and *zāḇaḥ,* "to sacrifice" (3:18; 5:3,8; 8:4,21,22,23,24,25[8,25,26, 27,28,29]).[48] The same applies to Ezk. 20:40. In contrast to its earlier sacrificial service to idols (v. 38), the future Israel will "serve" Yahweh on his holy mount, and Yahweh will accept *(rāṣâ, dāraš)* the sacrifices *(tᵉrûmôṯ, maśśā'ôṯ).*

Dt. 28:47 is probably also referring to cultic service, since it is to take place *bᵉśimḥâ,* and *śimḥâ* basically belongs in a cultic context. Isa. 19:21 says explicitly that the Egyptians will serve Yahweh with sacrifices *(zeḇaḥ, minḥâ).* Zeph. 3:9 associates foreign nations' service to Yahweh with the invocation of his name, and v. 10 mentions the presentation of offerings. Mal. 3:14 is equivocal. The statement "it is vain *(šāw')* to serve God" occurs in a context that speaks of keeping God's regulations *(mišmereṯ).* I. Riesener concludes from the mention of the righteous and the wicked in v. 18 (the former "serves" God, the latter does not "serve" him) that this involves some cultic-religious matter, though no reference to actual cultic service can be strictly demonstrated.[49]

Ps. 100:2 calls to worship: "Serve Yahweh with gladness; come into his presence with singing." Ps. 22:31(30) is similarly cultic: "Posterity will serve him; (future) generations will be told about the Lord." In Ps. 102 the juxtaposition with praise and narrative (vv. 19,22[18,21]) suggests that the reference to serving in v. 23(22) is to be associated with cultic service. Although "serve Yahweh with fear" in 2:11 might be referring to the subjugation of rebellious kings, much suggests that it refers instead to cultic worship of Yahweh.[50] In 2 Ch. 35:3 service consists in celebrating the Passover festival.

Worshiping other gods is the antithesis to serving Yahweh. Only in isolated instances does this particular usage appear outside the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic writings and the book influenced by it, Jeremiah. Ps. 97:7, however, insists that "all worshipers of images *('ōḇᵉḏê pesel)* are put to shame, those who make their boast in worthless idols *(hammiṯhalᵉlîm bā'ᵉlîlîm)*"; and Ps. 106:35f. describes the apostasy of the Israelites as follows: "but they mingled with the nations and learned to do as they did. They served their idols *('āṣāḇ).*"

The expression "serve other gods" appears first in the Decalog: "You shall not bow down *(hištaḥᵃwâ)* to other gods or serve them" (MT *to'oḇdēm* looks like hophal but is probably to be taken as qal) (Ex. 20:5 = Dt. 5:9; similarly also Ex. 23:24). Warnings against serving *('bd)* other gods occur frequently in Deuteronomy, often in connection with *hištaḥᵃwâ* as a designation for cultic veneration (Dt. 4:19; 8:19; 11:16; 17:3; 29:25[26]; 30:17) or with *hālaḵ 'aḥᵃrê* (28:14), a frequent reference to the cultic festival procession.[51] Within the Deuteronomistic history, this combination with *hištaḥᵃwâ*

---

48. Concerning the problem of determining sources, see Lindhagen, 93.
49. Riesener, 254.
50. Ibid., 233.
51. Ibid., 207; cf. F. J. Helfmeyer, *Die Nachfolge Gottes im AT. BBB* 29 (1968), 190f., 210ff.

occurs in Josh. 23:16; 1 K. 9:9; 22:54(53); 2 K. 10:18; 21:3,21,[52] while Jgs. 2:19 adds *hālaḵ ʾaḥᵃrê*. The same usage recurs in Jeremiah, i.e., *ʿāḇaḏ* alone (16:13; 44:3) or together with *hištaḥᵃwâ* and/or *hālaḵ ʾaḥᵃrê* (11:10; 13:10; 16:11; 22:9; 25:6; 35:15). The association with "breaking" or "forsaking the covenant" (11:10; 22:9) is worth noting insofar as it implies a theological interpretation of such worship of other gods.

Other expressions with foreign gods as objects of *ʿāḇaḏ* include "their [the nations'] gods *(ʾᵉlōhêhem)*" (*ʿāḇaḏ* alone in Dt. 7:16; 12:2,30; Jgs. 3:6; 2 K. 17:33; with *hištaḥᵃwâ* or other synonyms in Ex. 23:24; Josh. 23:7), "foreign gods *(ʾᵉlōhê nēḵār)*" (Josh. 24:20; Jer. 5:19, in both instances with "forsake [*ʿāzaḇ*] Yahweh)," *baʿal/bᵉʿālîm* (sg. Jgs. 2:13; 1 K. 16:31; 22:54[53]; 2 K. 10:18f.,21-23; 17:16, i.e., primarily in connection with the struggle against the Baʿal religion during the period of the waning Omride dynasty; pl. Jgs. 2:11; 3:7; 10:6,10; 1 S. 12:10 as a projection back into the earlier period),[53] "host of heaven" *(ṣᵉḇāʾ haššāmayim)* and other celestial designations (Dt. 4:19; 2 K. 21:3 par. 2 Ch. 33:3; Jer. 8:2), also *gillulîm* (2 K. 17:12; 21:21; Ezk. 20:39), "objects made by human hands, of wood and stone" (Dt. 4:28), *pesel* (Ps. 97:7), and *ʿᵃṣabbîm* (see above). Only in isolated instances is *ʿāḇaḏ* associated here with other cultically anchored verbs, though the expressions otherwise usually occur in cultic contexts. In all likelihood *ʿāḇaḏ* has an extended meaning here in the sense of "venerate," "follow."[54]

b. Almost exclusively in Deuteronomy and in the Deuteronomistic history, *ʿāḇaḏ* is used with Yahweh as its object in a sense that, as the synonyms show, far transcends any specifically cultic context. Thus we read in Dt. 6:13: "Yahweh your God you shall fear; him you shall serve, and by his name alone you shall swear" (similarly also 10:20). Hence here the correct posture toward Yahweh is circumscribed with the verbs *yārēʾ*, *ʿāḇaḏ*, and *šbʿ* niphal, and the issue is thus faithfully to worship Yahweh alone.[55] Dt. 13:5(4) expands the number of descriptive verbs even further to include *hālaḵ ʾaḥᵃrê* (see above), *šāmar miṣwôṯ*, "keep commandments," *šmʿ bᵉqôl*, "heed the voice," *dāḇaq*, "follow," *yārēʾ*, and *ʿāḇaḏ*. This is thus a religious and ethical disposition encompassing a person's entire life, one coming to expression especially in the obedient keeping of the commandments. This also emerges from 10:12f.: "So now, O Israel, what does Yahweh your God require of you? Only to fear Yahweh your God, to walk in all his ways, to love him, to serve Yahweh your God with all your heart and with all your soul, and to keep the commandments of Yahweh and his decrees." This series thus also adds *ʾāhaḇ*, "to love," and it is worth noting that the qualification "with all your heart and with all your soul" otherwise occurs primarily with this verb (6:5, etc.). A passage such as 29:24f.(25f.) shows that "serving other gods" simultaneously means "forsaking Yahweh's *bᵉrîṯ* (cf. the preceding discussion of Jer. 11:10). In a reverse fashion, serving Yahweh means keeping his covenant.

The term *ʿāḇaḏ* constitutes a central motif in the narrative of the assembly at

52. Riesener, 219.
53. See Floss, 163.
54. Ibid., 164.
55. Riesener, 205.

Shechem in Josh. 24. The core statement is v. 15: "Choose this day whom you will serve, whether the gods your ancestors served in the region beyond the River or the gods of the Amorites in whose land you are living; but as for me and my household, we will serve Yahweh." The people must choose, and they choose to serve Yahweh (vv. 18,21,24). Precisely this decision then becomes the foundation of the covenant itself (v. 25a). This service is specified more closely as putting away *(hēsîr)* the foreign gods, inclining *(hiṭṭâ)* one's heart to Yahweh (v. 23), and "hearkening to his voice" (v. 24). By contrast, "serving other gods" means "forsaking" *('āzaḇ)* Yahweh (Jgs. 10:10,13; cf. 3:7: "forgetting [*šāḵaḥ*] Yahweh").

The book of Judges mentions in several passages that because the Israelites serve other gods, Yahweh withholds his political help from them (Jgs. 2:19-21; 3:7f.; 10:13: "You have abandoned me and worshiped other gods; therefore I will deliver you no more"). When the Israelites then do away with those foreign gods and serve Yahweh, he is compassionate toward them (Jgs. 10:16; cf. 1 S. 7:3f.).[56]

The term *'āḇad* again represents the keyword in the great discourse Samuel delivers concerning the introduction of kingship (1 S. 12). First, Samuel cites the people's confession of sin from Jgs. 10:10: "We have sinned, because we have forsaken Yahweh, and have served the Baals and the Astartes; but now rescue us out of the hand of our enemies, and we will serve you" (v. 10). In what follows, the familiar motifs from Deuteronomy recur. They should fear Yahweh, serve him, and heed his voice (v. 14); not turn aside from Yahweh *(sûr mē'aḥ^{a}rê)* but serve him with all their heart (v. 20), fear him, and serve him faithfully *(b^{e}'emeṯ)* and with all their heart (v. 24).

1-2 Kings actually speak only about serving other gods (see above). Only once is the distinction made between *'aḇḏê* (!) *YHWH* and *'ōḇ^{e}ḏê habba'al* (2 K. 10:23).

Jeremiah, too, is concerned almost exclusively with serving other gods; the expression *'āḇad YHWH* occurs only once. In the coming time of salvation, Israel will "serve Yahweh their God and David their king" (Jer. 30:9). Mal. 3:14 equates "serving God" and "keeping his commandments."

In Job 21:15 the wicked say: "What is Shaddai, that we should serve him?" Here "serving" is apparently the approximate equivalent of "venerating, honoring." In the passage already discussed, Job 36:11f., "heeding" and "serving" are used together and are almost synonymous; *'āḇad,* however, has no object here.

III. The Substantive *'eḇeḏ*. The subst. *'eḇeḏ* refers to a person who is subordinated to someone else. This subordination can manifest itself in various ways, however, and *'eḇeḏ* accordingly can have different meanings: slave, servant, subject, official, vassal, or "servant" or follower of a particular god.

1. *Slave.* The term *'eḇeḏ* with the meaning "slave" (with the corresponding fem. forms *'āmâ/šiphâ;* cf. Ex. 21:7) is clearly distinguished from *śāḵîr,* "paid laborer, wage earner" (so Lev. 25:38f.). According to Ex. 21:21, slaves are "the money" *(kesep),* i.e., the property, of their master. According to Lev. 25:46, they are *'^{a}ḥuzzâ,* "possession,"

56. Ibid., 214.

and can be bought (Ex. 21:2; Lev. 25:44; Eccl. 2:7 [note → סגלה *s^e^gullâ* in v. 8]) or given as a gift (Gen. 20:14). Slaves are mentioned in "property formulae" as the property of another in addition to livestock, gold, and silver (Gen. 12:16; 20:14; 24:35; 30:43; 32:6[5]; 1 S. 8:16; 2 K. 5:26; Eccl. 2:7). The laws concerning slaves are found in Ex. 21:2-11(3-12), Dt. 15:12-18, and Lev. 25:39-55. The Book of the Covenant addresses the issue of "Hebrew"[57] slaves. They are to serve six years, and in the seventh year are to be released. If they choose to stay, however, they must "serve" (be a slave) *l^e^'ôlām,* i.e., for life. The female slave becomes a kind of concubine of her master, and is not to be released in the seventh year, though under certain circumstances she can be redeemed for a price *(pāḏâ).*[58]

Dt. 15 also provides for the release of a "Hebrew" slave (who is also called "brother" here) in the seventh year. Furthermore, the master is to "provide liberally" from his own "flock, threshing floor, and winepress" to help alleviate the problems of provisioning that the former slave may experience, a stipulation justified with a reference to Israel's own time of slavery in Egypt (v. 15). The slave owner is also motivated to release by the recollection that the slave "gave services worth the wages of hired laborers" for six years. Female slaves were probably also to be released in the seventh year. Jer. 34:14 shows that this release stipulation was not always followed (here, as in Deuteronomy, the reference is again to *'āḥ,* i.e., to a "fellow citizen").

The Holiness Code no longer uses the designation "Hebrew," speaking instead only of the "brother." Actual property now includes only foreign slaves (Lev. 25:44-46), whereas the indigenous slave (here the issue is debt slavery, v. 39) is to be treated as a wage earner (*śāḵîr,* vv. 39-41). The justification for this is that the Israelites themselves are actually Yahweh's *'^a^ḇāḏîm* whom he liberated from Egypt. The ultimate point of this is that, strictly speaking, no Israelite can really ever become the slave of another Israelite.[59]

Neh. 5:5 mentions a case of debt slavery. Amos criticizes the purchase or sale of the poor (2:6; 8:6), albeit without using the word *'eḇeḏ;* here, too, the reference is probably to debt slavery.

As far as the view of slavery itself is concerned, on the one hand some texts presuppose that the harsh existence and subjugation of slaves is quite "normal" (Job 7:2; 19:16; Eccl. 10:7; cf. also Prov. 29:19,21).[60] On the other hand some statements assume that a slave's existence can be improved (Prov. 17:2, "he will share the inheritance as one of the family"; cf. 30:10). Job 31:13-15 demonstrates that the slave, too, was created by Yahweh, and that Yahweh thus intervenes to preserve his or her rights.[61] It is also noteworthy that Abraham's slave in Gen. 24 acts as Abraham's fully authorized representative, and that slaves participate in circumcision (Gen.

---

57. → עברי *'iḇrî.*

58. S. M. Paul (*Studies in the Book of the Covenant in the Light of Cuneiform and Biblical Law. SVT* 18 [1970]) compares similar regulations in Nuzi.

59. Riesener, 127.

60. Ibid., 132.

61. Ibid., 133.

17:12f.,23ff.), in the sabbath celebration (Ex. 20:9f.; 23:12; Dt. 5:14f.), in Passover (Ex. 12:48f.), and in other festivals (Lev. 25:6; Dt. 12:12,18; 16:11,14). In Joel 3:2(2:29) the insistence that even male and female slaves receive a portion in Yahweh's Spirit shows the change in social values. It is further interesting that the slave owner in Israel is called *'āḏôn,* "lord, master," rather than *ba'al,* "owner" (as in Babylon, *bēlu*).[62]

2. *Excursus: Slavery in Israel's Environs.* a. Slaves in ancient Mesopotamia (Sum. *ùr,* Akk. *wardum/ardu,* Neo-Bab. usually *qallu*) were first of all prisoners of war who were used for heavy labor in public works projects. A second source of slaves was indebted free persons; if unable to pay debts in any other way, such persons sold either themselves or their children into bondage. The Code of Hammurabi stipulates that a debt slave was to serve for three years, and in the fourth was to be released. A debt slave *(nipūtum),* however, was not a slave in the normal sense and enjoyed far better status.

The slave was basically an object in the hands of the master. The Sumerians counted slaves by *sag,* "head," i.e., by "piece." Damage to a slave was viewed as a loss for the owner. Slaves themselves, however, could acquire possessions to a limited extent. A distinction was made between private domestic slaves and those in public service (e.g., of the palace or temple). Court and palace slaves *(arad ekalli)* seem to have enjoyed a somewhat better status, as did temple slaves (oblates, Akk. *šerku*), who were given as gifts to the deity and were not slaves in the real sense. Because Mesopotamia had no real industry or more broadly based economic structure, the number of private slaves was relatively small, and only later did their numbers increase.

In general, slaves seem to have been treated fairly well, though the ongoing dependency is often emphasized: "Friendship lasts but a day, service a lifetime."[63] Although slaves were identified by a special marking, we still frequently read about attempts at flight. Slaves could attain freedom through adoption or redemption (*ipṭiru,* "redemption money"); in the first case, the freed slave was obligated to pay support to the former master for life. Such releases took place through symbolic gestures "on the shore of the river, at the place of judgment." At certain festivals class boundaries were suspended, and masters and slaves celebrated together; indeed, at the New Year's Festivals they even exchanged roles.

b. The Egyptian terminology relating to slaves is fluid, and there were apparently different forms of dependency, including serfdom, compulsory labor, and genuine slavery. Originally, all land belonged to the king, and all were obligated to work for him. During the period of the Old Kingdom, private ownership gradually emerged with regard to fields and persons. Designations for slaves include *b3k,* "worker," *ḥm,* "servant, slave" (also in reference to subjects of the king and "servants" of a god),[64] *mr.t/mry.t* as collective terms for "slaves," *ḏt,* lit. "body," and its derivative *ḇ-ḏ(y)t.* Slave

62. Cf. A. Jepsen, *Untersuchungen zum Bundesbuch. BWANT* III/5 (1927), 25.
63. *BWL,* 259, 9.
64. *WbÄS,* III, 87f.

owners include temples, kings, and beginning with the Old Kingdom also officials, priests, officers, and others. The number of private slaves was relatively small.

Slaves were part of their master's possessions and were often mentioned along with fields and livestock, being counted by *tp,* "head." In the New Kingdom, prisoners of war were often distributed to officers and were called "the people my arm won." Slaves from Syria-Palestine are mentioned, as are those from Punt; indigenous slaves are relatively rare.

Despite all this, slaves did enjoy certain human rights. They could acquire property and appear as witnesses, and in general were treated well.

Both the purchase and sale of slaves were officially registered and authorized. Only once do we read about a release occurring through a simple arbitrary act of the owner, and this was associated with an adoption.[65] The loaning of female slaves for a certain number of days is attested in the Eighteenth Dynasty. Slaves could be passed on as inheritance, and the children of slaves became slaves themselves. If a slave fled, the owner could demand him or her back regardless of where the slave ended up.

3. *The Israelites in Egypt.* References to the Israelites as *'eḇeḏ* or *'ᵃḇāḏîm* in Egypt (Dt. 5:15; 6:21; 15:15; 24:18,22; in Exodus, only the verb *'āḇaḏ* is used: 1:13; 5:18; 6:5; 14:5,12; cf. Gen. 15:13f.) lend a unique coloring to the understanding of *'eḇeḏ.* The work of the Israelites in Egypt is described as *'ᵃḇōḏâ qāšâ* (Ex. 1:14; 6:9; only as *'ᵃḇōḏâ* in 1:14; 2:23; 5:11; 6:6), also as → מַס *mas,* "compulsory labor" (Ex. 1:11). In the "king's law" in 1 S. 8:11-18, Samuel says that the Israelites will be the king's *'ᵃḇāḏîm,* and although this could mean compulsory labor, it more likely refers to the subjects' complete dependency.[66]

4. *Vassals.* Like the verb *'āḇaḏ,* the subst. *'eḇeḏ* also occasionally refers to the vassal relationship. Thus Ahaz says to Tiglath-pileser: "I am your *'eḇeḏ* and your son"; he sends tribute and accordingly expects the Assyrian king to support him (2 K. 16:7f.). Hoshea becomes Shalmaneser's vassal and pays tribute (17:3). Jehoiakim is the vassal of Nebuchadnezzar for three years before rebelling against him (24:1). 2 Ch. 12:8 recounts that Rehoboam and the princes of Israel became Pharaoh Shishak's *'ᵃḇāḏîm.* The returned exiles call themselves *'ᵃḇāḏîm* of the Persian king (Ezra 9:9), though when 2 Ch. 36:20 calls those deported to Babylon the *'ᵃḇāḏîm* of Nebuchadnezzar, this refers to dependency of a completely different sort.

Ringgren

5. *'eḇeḏ of the King.* The *'eḇeḏ* of the king is attested both in the OT and in inscriptions on service seals found in Israel. The terminology is *'bd hmlk* or *'bd* + the king's name.[67]

---

65. *JEA* 26, 23ff.
66. Riesener, 139. See the discussion of the verb above.
67. Lindhagen, 36-39.

The relation attaching to the word *'eḇeḏ* is dynamic.[68] In this title construction, the *nomen regens* indicates the master to whom the *'eḇeḏ* is subject. This is not the same as the relationship involving the *śārîm,* the ministers (1 K. 4:1ff.). In this meaning, *śar* is a status term.

Neither the OT itself nor any epigraphic witnesses from Israel suggest identifying these two groups of functionaries in the sense that the *śārîm,* too, are actually servants of the king.[69] When in an address to the king a minister is described as his *'eḇeḏ* (2 S. 14:19f.; 15:34; 18:29), this merely reflects a convention customary in both the OT and the ancient Orient at large,[70] and does not mean that the speaker is a slave of the addressee. The designation of ministers as *'ᵃḇāḏîm* in 2 K. 19:5 par. Isa. 37:5 and Nu. 22:18 derives from their functions as emissaries; the emissary is always the *'eḇeḏ* of his commissioning client.

Several characteristic series mention the *'ᵃḇāḏîm* of the king along with the king (or Pharaoh), and some also in connection with the people (Gen. 41:37; Ex. 5:21; 7:28[8:3]; 8:20[24]; 10:6; Dt. 29:1[2]; Jer. 22:2; 25:19). Series of this sort circumscribe a given king's sphere of rule, while enumerations in which *śārîm* appear are based on a different perspective. The *śārîm,* along with the kings, priests, and prophets, are Israel's functionaries (Neh. 9:32,34; Jer. 1:18; 2:26; 8:1; 32:32; 44:17,21; Dnl. 9:6,8), a concept already providing the foundation for the Deuteronomic draft constitution (Dt. 16:18–18:22).

The middle position is occupied by those officials whose title does indeed contain the element *śar* but who nonetheless do not belong to the group of ministers. These are usually military commanders who can also be designated as the *'ᵃḇāḏîm* of the king (1 K. 16:9; 2 K. 9:5,11; 25:8).

As members of the court (cf. Gen. 40:20), the *'ᵃḇāḏîm* of the king are also members of his house (2 S. 9:2; 15:14ff.). The term *bayiṯ* refers to the followers or adherents of a ruler and can also include those in the military sphere (2 S. 3:1,6); this suggests that *bayiṯ* in connection with kingship should not be understood too strictly from the overly narrow perspective of "dynasty." A comparable phenomenon is the Aramaean organization of northern Syria.[71]

The functions of royal *'ᵃḇāḏîm* are determined by their close connection with the king, a connection Max Weber suggests characterizes the patrimonial organization of officials.[72] Thus do they appear as messengers and emissaries of the king in 2 S. 10:2; 1 K. 5:15(1). The *'ᵃḇāḏîm* in 1 S. 16:14ff. are so concerned about the king's welfare that they suggest engaging a lyre player to help Saul overcome his psychological depression. In 1 S. 28:23 such concern about the fate of their lord comes to expression in their insistence that Saul eat even though he has just learned he will die on the following day. In 1 K. 1:2ff. this group is concerned with invigorating the king. Finally, such

68. Riesener, 268ff.
69. See Rüterswörden, 4ff.
70. See I.2.d above and III.6, 7 below.
71. Rüterswörden, 15ff.
72. *Economy and Society,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans., Berkeley, 1978), II, 1006ff.

attachment to the king comes to expression not least when it is the *'ᵃbāḏîm* who bury their king (2 K. 9:28; 23:30). As members of the king's "house," the *'ᵃbāḏîm* are also involved in their master's family matters. They participate in courting a bride (1 S. 25:39ff.; cf. 18:20-26), are concerned when the king grieves (2 S. 13:31,36), and congratulate him when a joyous occasion calls for it (1 K. 1:47).

The king supports his *'ᵃbāḏîm* by enfeoffing them with land (1 S. 8:14; cf. 22:7) or by granting them tax revenues (1 S. 8:15), in the process enabling them to attain a certain level of wealth. The draft constitution in the book of Ezekiel also allows that the ruler's *'ᵃbāḏîm* could receive fiefs (Ezk. 46:17). Given the close relationship between the *'eḇeḏ* and the king, it must have appeared particularly condemnable when an *'eḇeḏ* rebelled or conspired against the master, or actually killed him (1 K. 11:26 par. 2 Ch. 13:6; 2 K. 12:21f.[20f.]; 2 K. 14:5 par. 2 Ch. 25:3; 2 K. 21:23 par. 2 Ch. 33:24).

Word statistics show that the king's *'eḇeḏ* noticeably recedes in the parallel accounts of Chronicles compared with the Deuteronomistic history.[73] One possible explanation may be the Chronicler's adoption of the thesis that Solomon did not make any of the Israelites into *'ᵃbāḏîm* (2 Ch. 8:9), a thesis providing the basis for his own portrayal. This is probably also the perspective from which to understand the occasional references in Chronicles to foreign *'ᵃbāḏîm* of the king (24:25f.). Furthermore, the Chronicler's history also insinuates that the number of Solomon's *'ᵃbāḏîm* was comparatively quite small (Ezr. 2:43-58), and one notices that they appear in connection with the temple personnel. In the book of Jeremiah factions develop at the royal court along the lines of the two titles *śar* and *'eḇeḏ*. Whereas the *śārîm* take Jeremiah's side in Jer. 36, the *'ᵃbāḏîm* follow the king's reaction.

Rüterswörden

6. *Self-Designation as an Expression of Obsequiousness.* In some instances the term *'eḇeḏ* becomes a formulaic expression of obsequiousness: subjects over against the king, vassals over against the feudal lord, and persons in dependent relationships call themselves *'aḇdᵉḵā*, "your servant." This is the case with Jacob over against his brother Esau after returning from Haran (Gen. 32:5,19,21[4,18,20]; 33:5; cf. *'aḇdî*, 33:14), with Esau being called *'ᵃḏōnî* (32:5,19[4,18]; 33:8,13f.). Although this is, of course, an expression of courtesy, at the same time Jacob is acknowledging his dependency and seeking his brother's favor. In 2 S. 9:11 Nathan calls himself *'aḇdᵉḵā* and addresses David as *'ᵃḏōnî hammeleḵ*. This probably represents first of all an example of "courtly style," and, as is often the case elsewhere as well, the self-designation *'aḇdᵉḵā* is used in connection with a request (cf. 1 S. 12:19; 20:8; 22:15; 25:8; 26:19f.; 2 S. 13:24; 2 K. 16:7; 18:26). On the one hand, the formula expresses humility and subjugation,[74] while on the other it reflects the hope that the *'eḇeḏ* can expect a certain degree of goodwill from his *'āḏôn*.[75] Similarly, one king can refer to himself as the *'eḇeḏ* of another king

73. Rüterswörden, 12f.
74. Lande, 68ff.
75. Lindhagen, 56-60.

(1 K. 20:9,32). The Arad and Lachish letters as well as a letter from Yavneh-yam contain numerous examples of this usage.[76]

7. *Self-Designation in the Psalms.* The self-designation *'eḇeḏ* is also used in religious contexts, especially in the Psalms. Of the 57 occurrences in the Psalms, 14 are in Ps. 119 (vv. 17,23,38,49,65,76,84,91,122,124,125,135,140,176). Otherwise it usually occurs in laments of the individual (27:9; 31:17[16]; 35:27; 69:18[17]; 86:2,4,16; 89:51[50]; 102:15,29[14,28]; 109:28; 143:2,12), especially in petitions (so also in 19:14[13] and several times in Ps. 119), though also occasionally in a thanksgiving hymn (116:16; cf. also 35:27). The petitioner is usually entreating God to show his concern and to offer help, and by using this self-designation is hoping to portray himself as someone dependent on Yahweh's goodness,[77] and perhaps to adduce precisely his identity as *'eḇeḏ* as a reason for God's intervention (cf. the *kî* in 143:12, "for I am your servant," and probably also 116:16).[78] Synonyms show that in Ps. 119 *'eḇeḏ* is above all someone who keeps the law.[79]

The *aradka* style of Akkadian penitential psalms is comparable, in which the penitent is introduced as "your servant" (with verbs of the 3rd person). Although B. Landsberger views this as a "disguised 1st person," the alternation between *aradka* and normal 1st person forms in several instances suggests to some that the *aradka* pieces actually represent the intercessory petition of the priest.[80] In most cases, however, the explicit designation is *anāku aradka,* "I, your servant," indicating that *aradka* is indeed a 1st person designation.[81]

This religious usage occurs only rarely outside the Psalms. The expression *'aḇdᵉḵā* is used 3 times in connection with *māṣā' ḥēn,* "find favor."[82] Abraham uses it in Gen. 18:3, Lot in his plea to be permitted to flee to the hills (Gen. 19:19; cf. v. 2), and Moses in his reproachful question to God, "Why have you treated your servant so badly? Why have I not found favor in your sight?" (Nu. 11:11). In other words this self-designation is always associated with the motif of having one's plea accepted, as Dt. 3:24 also shows. According to Gen. 32:11(10), God showed both *ḥeseḏ* and *'ᵉmeṯ* to Jacob, his servant. At his calling, Moses refers to himself as *'aḇdᵉḵā* (Ex. 4:10), and in 1 S. 3:9 Samuel says, "Speak, Yahweh, for your servant is listening." In both cases the designation alludes to the future prophetic office.[83] David refers to himself as "your servant" several times in prayers (1 S. 23:10f.; 25:39; 2 S. 7:19,21,25,27 par. 1 Ch. 17:17,19, 23,27; 2 S. 24:10 par. 1 Ch. 21:8). Finally, Solomon uses this self-designation at his en-

---

76. Arad ostracon 40:4; Lachish Letters 2:3,5; 3:1,5,7; 4:1; 5:3,6,10; 6:3,13; 8:6; 12:4; Yavneh-yam ostracon 2,3,4,8,9,13; see D. Pardee, *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters. SBLSBS* 15 (1982), in loc.

77. Riesener, 224f.

78. Lindhagen, 262-75.

79. Ibid., 263 n. 2.

80. Landsberger, *MAOG* 4 (1928-29), 309. Cf. *SAHG,* 270ff.

81. *SAHG,* 272, 320, 336, 342, 344, 348. Cf. N. Mayer, *Untersuchungen zur Formensprache der babylonischen Gebetsbeschwörungen* (Rome, 1976), 49f.; Seux, 362.

82. → חן *ḥēn* (V, 24f.).

83. Cf. III.9 below.

counter with Yahweh in Gibeon and at the temple dedication (1 K. 3:7-8; cf. v. 6, *māṣāʾ ḥēn* in connection with David as *'eḇeḏ;* 8:28-30,32). The first case involves thanksgiving and petition, the second only petition.

8. *Servant of Yahweh.* Just as *'āḇaḏ* means to venerate or worship a god, so also can a person be called the *'eḇeḏ* of Yahweh (though never of a foreign god;[84] a worshiper of Baʿal is called *'ōḇēḏ ba'al,* 2 K. 10:23). Only in isolated instances does *'eḇeḏ* mean simply "worshiper" (cf. Gen. 50:17, where Joseph's brothers call themselves "the *'aḇāḏîm* of the God of your father").

Individuals called *'eḇeḏ YHWH* (or *'aḇdî, 'aḇdeḵā*) include Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Caleb (Nu. 14:24), Joshua (Josh. 24:29; Jgs. 2:8), David, Eliakim (Isa. 22:20), Job (1:8; 2:3), Hezekiah, and Zerubbabel (Hag. 2:23). In the case of Abraham, Yahweh promises Isaac blessing and numerous descendants "for my servant Abraham's sake" (Gen. 26:24, addendum to J), a statement that can refer either to Abraham as the recipient of the promise or to his special merits (cf. the similar formula with reference to David in 2 K. 19:34; 20:6). To this one might add Ps. 105:6,42. In the prayer of his slave, Isaac is called "your [Yahweh's] servant" (Gen. 24:14). In Ezk. 28:25 and 37:25, Yahweh calls Jacob, as the bearer of the promise, "my servant." The three patriarchs are collectively called Yahweh's *'aḇāḏîm* (Ex. 32:13; Dt. 9:27), both times in a prayer and both times in the expression *zeḵōr le* as the reason for granting the plea.

Moses is usually called *'eḇeḏ YHWH* in formulaic references to him as lawgiver and mediator of God's commands (Josh. 1:7,13; 8:31,33; 11:12,15; 22:2,4,5; 2 K. 18:12; 21:8; 1 Ch. 6:34[49] [*'elōhîm*]; Neh. 1:7f.; 9:14; 10:30[29] [*'elōhîm*]; Mal. 3:22[4:4]), as a liberator (Ps. 105:6 par. Aaron), as leader in the wilderness (Josh. 14:7), and as distributor of the land of Transjordan (Josh. 1:15; 9:24; 12:6; 13:8; 18:7), and finally at the mention of his death (Dt. 34:5; Josh. 1:2). In the book of Joshua, Moses appears especially as the authority influencing Joshua's further activities. Ex. 14:31 (J?) is also rather formulaic; the Israelites believed in Yahweh and his servant Moses, who here appears as God's representative in some sense. Nu. 12:7f. (R^J) justifies this designation by pointing out that whereas Yahweh speaks to the prophets in visions, he speaks directly to his servant Moses, "face to face." He is, so to speak, the prophet who surpasses all other prophets, the mediator of revelation par excellence. He also appears as such in 1 K. 8:53,56: he announced Israel's election, and the words Yahweh spoke through him were indeed fulfilled. The *'eḇeḏ YHWH* is thus an honorific title of the mediator of revelation rather than an official title, and is referring to the special status of his relationship with God.

Whenever David is called *'eḇeḏ YHWH,* the context almost always involves election and the perpetual continuation of the dynasty. Yahweh will allow Rehoboam to keep one tribe because of David's earlier election (1 K. 11:13,32), the city of Jerusalem will be saved for David's sake (2 K. 19:34 par. Isa. 37:35; 2 K. 20:6), Yahweh's covenant with David will never pass away, and his dynasty will continue forever (Jer. 33:21f.,26 in a secondary piece not in the LXX). God made a covenant with his chosen one (cf.

---

84. Floss, 45f.

Ps. 78:70) and promised David that his descendants would reign in Israel forever (89:4[3]; cf. v. 21[20], God anointed him). This is ultimately also the issue in the introduction to the Nathan prophecy in 2 S. 7:5,8 ("Go and tell my *'eḇeḏ*"; cf. par. 2 Ch. 17:4,7), whereas 2 S. 3:18 (like 2 K. 19:34) is concerned with deliverance from enemies (cf. Ps. 144:10). The concluding words of Solomon's temple dedication prayer in 2 Ch. 6:42 (in part par. Ps. 132:10) are interesting: "Remember your steadfast love for your servant David." At this point in 1 K. 8, a reference appears to Israel's election through "Moses, your servant" (v. 53).[85] Only twice does the Deuteronomistic emphasis on obedience appear: when David is called the *'eḇeḏ* who keeps the commandments (1 K. 11:34; 14:8). To these one can add the Psalm superscriptions in Ps. 18 and 36 (MT v. 1 in each case), though these are not particularly revealing.

It is striking that neither the Deuteronomistic history nor the Chronicler's history refers to Solomon as *'eḇeḏ*. Among the other kings, only Hezekiah receives the title (and then only once, 2 Ch. 32:16) as the one who trusted in God and did not capitulate. Hence *'eḇeḏ YHWH* does not represent a characteristic royal epithet,[86] nor is the focus on (David's) special obedience but rather on David as the chosen one and as the one specially blessed. In Zec. 3:8 *'eḇeḏ* is the epithet for the anticipated *ṣemaḥ* ("branch," probably a messianic reference).

9. *Prophets as Yahweh's Servants.* Although it is Moses who in one instance appears as the *'eḇeḏ YHWH* in a special sense in comparison with the prophets, the prophets themselves are generally also designated in this way. Only in a few instances is the reference to an individual prophet (1 K. 14:18; 15:29, Ahijah of Shiloh; 2 K. 9:36; 10:10, Elijah; 2 K. 14:25, Jonah son of Amittai; Isa. 20:3, Isaiah). Only in one instance does a prophet refer to himself as *'eḇeḏ:* Elijah in his prayer at Carmel (1 K. 18:36; the fire for which he petitions is to show that Yahweh is God and that Elijah is his servant and has done all this at Yahweh's bidding). A true prophet and a true *'eḇeḏ YHWH* does everything at the bidding of his God (see the verb *'āḇaḏ* in Jer. 5:19).

Otherwise it is Yahweh himself who calls the prophets *ᵃḇāḏay hannᵉḇî'îm.* As such, they are Yahweh's spokespersons through whom he warns Israel and makes his will known. He has repeatedly sent these prophets to his people (Jer. 7:25; 25:4; 26:5; 29:19; 35:15; 44:4), and it is through them that he speaks to Israel (1 K. 14:18; 15:29; 2 K. 9:36; 10:10; 14:25; 17:23; 21:10; 24:2, all from the Deuteronomistic history; and Ezk. 38:17). They speak in the name of Yahweh (Dnl. 9:6; cf. Ezr. 9:11; Jer. 35:15; 44:4), and through them Yahweh makes his commandments known (2 K. 17:13; Ezr. 9:11; Dnl. 9:10). They have access to Yahweh's *sôḏ* and thus can proclaim all that he intends to do (Am. 3:7). When he proclaims his words and decisions through them, so also does it take place (Zec. 1:6). Finally, he also avenges their blood (2 K. 9:7).[87]

Ringgren

---

85. Concerning the *ḥasḏê dāwîḏ,* → חסד *ḥeseḏ,* IV.5 (V, 58f.).
86. Lindhagen, 280-84.
87. Ibid., 277-80.

10. *'eḇeḏ in Deutero-Isaiah.* The word *'eḇeḏ* (sg.) occurs 19 times in Deutero-Isaiah, including 12 times with the 1st person suffix, twice with the 3rd person suffix, twice with the prep. l^e, once with k^e, and twice without any further qualification; the plural occurs twice (54:17; 44:26a).[88] Several texts identify *'āḇaḏ* through an apposition with Israel (41:8; 44:1,21 [bis]; 45:4; 49:3), with Jacob (41:8; 44:1,2,21; 45:4; 48:20), or with Jeshurun (44:2). Yahweh directly addresses the servant Israel as *(we)'attâ* in 41:8,9; 44:21; 49:3; and as "my chosen" in 45:4. Election is expressed with the verb *bḥr* in 41:8,9; 44:1,2.

a. *The 'eḇeḏ Israel.* (1) Isa. 41:8-13 is construed much like the oracles of salvation to a king in situations of dangers,[89] sharing with them elements such as address (name, role, and title of the recipient; vv. 8-9), the formula "do not fear" (vv. 10a,13b; accompanied in Isaiah by the formula of support, "for I am with you," vv. 10,13a), the assurance of God's intervention and the defeat of enemies (vv. 11-12), and God's self-introduction (v. 13a) with reference to his activities on behalf of those he protects (vv. 8b,9,10b).[90] In the exilic situation, the oracle addresses not the king but the humiliated people (even though they are now occupying the king's place; *yiśrā'ēl 'aḇdî,* v. 8; *'aḇdî 'attâ,* v. 9), either in the Babylonian exile or amid the difficulties in rebuilding the country. It does not seem possible to specify the oracle's life setting any more precisely. The expressions *ḥzq* (hiphil) *min* (v. 9; *'mṣ* in v. 10b; cf. Dt. 31:6,7,23)[91] and *tmk* (v. 10; cf. Ps. 16:5; 17:5; 41:13[12]; 63:9[8]) confirm this impression. A description of Isa. 41:8-13 as an assurance of salvation or of victory is more commensurate with the textual type than the problematic attempt to identify it as a priestly oracle of salvation.[92]

(2) Isa. 44:1-2 is part of an oracle of salvation or response (43:22–44:5), even if v. 1 "represents a transition added only later."[93] The text's vocabulary also resembles 41:8-13 in its use of "my servant" (44:1,2), the verbs *bḥr* and *'zr,* and the formula "fear not."

(3) Isa. 44:21-22 is an oracle of consolation and admonition[94] dependent on the preceding and following verses. "You are my servant" — this is what Jacob and Israel are to contemplate (v. 21a). This is the ground of the assurance given Israel; their God will never forsake them (v. 21b). The expression *yṣr* is shared with 44:2.

(4) A nominal clause in 45:4 explains the purpose of the choice and sending of Cyrus as God's instrument; "for the sake of *(lema'an)* my servant Jacob, and Israel my chosen, I call you by your name."

(5) Upon setting out for home from exile, the people are to proclaim, "Yahweh has redeemed his servant Jacob!" (48:20).[95]

---

88. Cf. *BHS;* a different view is taken by Hermisson, *ZTK* 79 (1982) 7-9.

89. Cf., e.g., the oracle to Esarhaddon, *ANET,* 449-50.

90. Cf. Vincent, 124-76.

91. Cf. A. S. van der Woude, "חזק *ḥzq* to be firm," *TLOT,* I, 405.

92. R. P. Merendino, "Literarkritisches, Gattungskritisches und Exegetisches zu Jes 41,8-16," *Bibl* 53 (1972) 1-42. Cf. Conrad, 151.

93. K. Elliger, *Deuterojesaja (40,1–45,7). BK* XI/1 (1978), 369.

94. Ibid., 443.

95. Cf. Merendino, *Der Erste und der Letzte,* 533.

(6) The identity of the servant in 49:1-6(7) is disputed. All mss. (with the exception of Kennicott 96, which is of doubtful value in any case) and all ancient versions attest the word "Israel" in v. 3.

The difficulty attaching to Israel being sent to Israel (v. 5) is resolved by assuming that a "remnant" is the object of such sending. The identification of the servant with Israel is not really off the mark, particularly since it is already asserted in 41:8; 44:1,2,21; 45:4; 48:20.[96] The vocabulary confirms that this does indeed refer to Israel, and also explains further the function of the text. Being called "before I was born/in the womb" (vv. 1,5; cf. Jer. 1:5, *yṣr*) refers to an individual, and unequivocally refers to Israel in 44:2,24 *(yṣr)*. The notion of "hiding away" (*ḥb'*, 49:2) also appears in 42:22 (hophal), and is described in 51:16 with the verb *ksh* and accompanied by the expression "put my words in your mouth"; both expressions refer to the people. The word *p'r* in 49:3 also occurs in 44:23 (hithpael), where Yahweh glorifies himself in *(bᵉ)* Israel, and in 55:5, where Yahweh glorifies Israel. In Deutero-Isaiah *tōhû* (v. 4) refers to the nations (40:17) and their rulers (40:23), gods (41:29) and their images (44:9). In 40:28,30,31; 43:22,23,24, *ygʿ* (v. 4) refers to Israel, and in 47:12,15 to the "Chaldeans." Fatigue is the sign of separation from Yahweh.

In 49:1-4a the servant Israel admits that he has spent his strength for *tōhû* and *heḇel*, and has forgotten his election and Yahweh's protection. In this context *ʿaḇdî 'attâ* is the honorific title to which Israel has become disloyal. V. 4b articulates Israel's resolve to improve: "Yet surely my cause is with Yahweh, and my action with my God." Elsewhere in Deutero-Isaiah *pʿl* refers to Yahweh's own activity (41:4; 43:13; 45:9,11), so that here, too, "his *pᵉʿullâ*" belongs in Yahweh's sphere (40:10). That is, the gods are incapable of "taking action" (41:24).

Verses 5-6 constitute a foreign body within 49:1-6. Contrary to its usual function (43:1; 44:1; 47:8; 48:16; 52:5), *wᵉʿattâ* does not interrupt the relationship with what precedes it, nor does it really introduce the secondary clause within the same unit. Yahweh's announced discourse is interrupted in v. 5b by the servant's remark in the 1st person, and then taken up again only in v. 6 with *wayyō'mer.* Nor is there any syntactical correspondence between the final inf. *lᵉšôḇēḇ* and the prefix conjugation niphal of *'sp*. Similarly, the negation *lō'* would have to be emended to *lô* to provide a unified statement.

Verse 5 allows a hypothetical resolution if one vocalizes *'āmar* as *'ōmar* and adds "Yahweh, who formed me," as part of the statement. The object of *lᵉšôḇēḇ* then becomes *wᵉyiśrā'ēl*, and *lō' yē'āsēp̱* must be translated, "he [Yahweh] will not conceal himself" (*'sp* niphal as "hide, conceal" seems possible; cf. Job 27:19; Ps. 104:22; Jer. 8:2). Although this interpretation raises the problem of separating the subject Yahweh from the predicate "will not conceal himself," it does allow vv. 1-5 to be read as a unit in which the servant Israel speaks in the 1st person.

Verse 6 is probably an addendum. There are no linguistic connections with vv. 1-5; *nᵉṣûrê (Q)* is semantically peculiar; v. 6b is theologically improbable (Yahweh seems

96. Lohfink, 218-28.

to delegate his exclusive attribute, namely, to extend his salvation); v. 6b lacks any correspondence with the emphatic assertion in v. 6a; finally, the compound expression "covenant to the people/light to the nations," whose original context is 42:6, is here divided between vv. 6 and 8.

Verse 6 is trying to correct the overly political interpretation of the servant Israel's role by ascribing to him features of the servant from 42:1-7. Isa. 49:7 is redactional (cf. 48:17), resonating with 52:15 and 53:3 to create a transition to 49:8-12(13).

Accordingly, the servant of 49:1-5(6) is doubtless identical with the people. He is given the commission to reestablish the land and to deliver the exiles (vv. 8-9), much to the chagrin and astonishment of the kings of the earth (v. 7), who previously had watched his humiliation.

b. *The Anonymous* 'eḇeḏ. (1) Isa. 42:1-7 is a unit, even though some understand vv. 5-9 (as also 49:7-12) as a transition between the "song" and the prophetic corpus.[97] Yahweh describes his servant as his chosen one whom he upholds *(tmk),* with whom he is pleased *(rṣh),* and upon whom he has put his Spirit. The unusual expression *hôṣî' mišpāṭ* means to present, implement, or make known justice, the law, righteousness, and judgment, though in this case also to reveal his own agenda (cf. 1QIsa^a *mišpāṭô*). V. 2 confirms that the reference is indeed sooner to the servant himself. He does not cry for help. Isa. 53:7 will later pick up his silence, though it is introduced already here.[98] The metaphors in vv. 3f. describe both the activity and the disposition of the servant.[99] Just as the servant himself will neither break the bruised reed nor quench the dimly burning wick, so also will it happen to him (cf. the repetition of the roots *khh* and *rṣṣ* in v. 4). Despite his weakness, the servant will carry out his commission of implementing the divine plan on earth (*mišpāṭ* here in a somewhat different sense than in vv. 1,3).

His commission is explained in vv. 6f. on the basis of the servant's calling; being a covenant to the people is part of God's gift (*b^erîṯ* here as Yahweh's obligation)[100] to human beings. The light to the nations is closely connected with v. 7, the vocabulary of which does not support a literal interpretation, "lead out of prison." Even though *masgēr, 'assîr,* and *bêṯ kele'* can indeed be understood concretely as "prison," a metaphorical meaning is more likely here (cf. *masgēr* in the broad sense: *rerum angustia,* Ps. 142:8[7] par. *š^e'ōl*).[101] Isa. 24:22 (par. *bôr*) allows a translation with "prison" only by way of petitio principii. The word *'assîr* presents a similar situation; 10:4 is a difficult text.[102] The expression *bêṯ kele'* suggests a storeroom rather than a prison in the real sense; prisons for larger groups were unknown in antiquity.[103] The emphasis on darkness suggests that "light to the nations" refers to deliverance from the darkness of

---

97. Cf. C. R. North, *Second Isaiah* (Oxford, 1964), 113; Cazelles.
98. H. Simian-Yofre, "Manifesterá su destino," 311-20.
99. Cf. Gressmann, *Der Messias,* 290; *ANET,* 385.
100. → ברית *b^erîṯ (b^erîth)* (II, 253-79).
101. *LexHebAram,* 451.
102. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 188ff.
103. M. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (Eng. trans., New York, 1977). Cf. *HAL,* II, 475, and 1 K. 22:27; 2 K. 17:4, etc.

not understanding one's own situation. This understanding also concurs with the commission to participate in blindness in 42:18-23 (*bātê kᵉlāʾîm* in v. 22) and to the illumination (understanding and making someone understand) in 43:8-13.

(2) Isa. 42:18-23 is a Yahweh oracle to a group concerning his servant. The blind servant (sg., v. 19) cannot simply be identified with the blind and deaf (pl.) whom v. 18 summons to hear and see and v. 23 addresses rhetorically. The term *mal'āḵ* (par. *'eḇeḏ*) is never used for Israel.[104] The form *mᵉšullām* (pual ptcp., "who has been chastised") corresponds to the piel participle (5 times in the OT, with Jer. 32:18 focusing on punishment for transgressions).

The verb forms in the singular in Isa. 42:20 confirm this interpretation. The MT vocalization for *lm'n* cannot be correct, since *ḥpṣ* is usually construed with *'eṯ/bᵉ* + direct object or with *lᵉ* + infinitive. Nowhere else is *lᵉma'an* used finally. It seems possible to read *lim'unneh* (pual ptcp. + *lamed relationis:* "Yahweh was pleased with his humbled one"; cf. Isa. 53:4, also pual ptcp., and 53:7, niphal of *'nh,* "be miserable, humbled"). If 42:20-22 does indeed refer to the servant (sg.), *hû'* in v. 22 probably also refers to him; though he is not himself the robbed and plundered people, he does identify with them. By contrast, the people are understood as a group of *baḥûrîm,* tired and weak (v. 22; cf. 40:30).

Accordingly, this text is a dispute between Yahweh and a blind, deaf people incapable of understanding that no one can rescue them from their robbed and plundered situation (except Yahweh). Yahweh's servant, who is blind in a particular way (*kî 'im* emphasizes his figure in a strictly limiting sense), does on the one hand find favor with Yahweh, and on the other identifies himself with the people. The text concludes with a rhetorical question summoning the group addressed in v. 18 to pay attention to what happens.

(3) Isa. 43:8-13 is a dispute between Yahweh and the gods (cf. 41:1-5; 41:21-29; 44:6-8; 45:20-22).[105] The dispute concerns the ability expressed by → נגד *ngd* hiphil. With Yahweh as the subject of *higgîḏ,* the verb has a revelatory function extending to future events (cf. 42:9; 44:8; 46:10; 48:3,5) but also addressing present situations and human conduct seen in a new light after Yahweh illuminates them (43:9,12; 45:19).[106]

Yahweh's superiority is evident in his witnesses[107] who have understood the meaning of the events he has interpreted (*zō'ṯ/ri'šōnôṯ,* v. 9; reversed in 41:26).

"My servant whom I have chosen" (43:10) is frequently viewed as a second predicate to "you," so that one reads "you are my witnesses and my servant." This reading, however, presents problems with the following final clause (*lᵉma'an).* A preceding understanding is the condition and essence of being a witness, not its purpose. Furthermore, the connection between the pl. "my witnesses" and the sg. "and my servant" presents problems, which is why some interpreters emend *'aḇdî* to *wa'ᵃḇāḏay.*[108] Fol-

---

104. Differently → מלאך *mal'āḵ,* VIII, 324.
105. Cf. Simian-Yofre, "Testigo y servidor."
106. → נגד *ngd,* IV.1.c(2) (IX, 181f.).
107. → עוד *'wd.*
108. Cf. Hermisson, *ZTK* 79 (1982) 4f.

lowing the MT, however, *ʿaḇdî* can be read in parallel with "my witnesses" as the subject of an incomplete nominal clause: "You are my witnesses, and my servant (is also my witness)."[109] The expression *lᵉmaʿan* then depends on "whom I have chosen."

The servant is a chosen witness so that others may know, understand, and trust, so that there can be real witnesses that "I am." The mysterious figure of the servant is thus to open blind eyes (cf. 42:7).

(4) In 50:10 *ʿaḇdô* secures the identity of the anonymous figure of 50:4-9a. The text, in the 1st person singular, evokes the image of a prisoner anticipating judgment (note the legal vocabulary in vv. 8-9a: *ṣdq, ryb, mišpāṭ, ršʿ* hiphil), one who has already suffered persecution (v. 6) but who through Yahweh is able to withstand his adversaries (vv. 4-5).

In this context *lāḏaʿaṯ lʿwt* means "be able to bend/defeat him who is weak/tired" (referring to Yahweh's adversaries, who as such are weak; cf. 40:28,30,31; and 10(2)b above). The term *lʿwt* might be vocalized as *lᵉʿawwēṯ/lᵉʿawwôṯ* (piel inf. of *ʿwt/ʿwh*); then "allow to deviate from the norm, bend, buckle," in a physical or ethical sense becomes "chastise" when Yahweh is the subject. This meaning approximates what was suggested. The certainty of being able to defeat the adversaries at a trial is also expressed in 54:17, but is then cruelly disappointed in 53:7-8.

(5) The term *ʿaḇdî* in 52:13 and 53:11 and the delimitation of the MT up through 53:12 as *sᵉṯûmāʾ* justify understanding 52:13–53:12 as a unit. The text has three sections. In the first (at least in 52:13) and third (53:11-12), Yahweh speaks; in 53:1-6, a "we" speaks.

There is no reason to introduce an additional speaker for 53:7-10, particularly since v. 10 speaks of Yahweh in the 3rd person. Despite philological difficulties, it is possible to understand 52:14-15 as part of the "we" discourse. Yahweh can be the subject both of *mšḥ* ("you have anointed"; cf. 1QIsa[a]) and of *yazzeh* (from *nzh*, "asperse").

The relationship between the servant and the many is peculiar to this text. Several expressions suggest only a certain connection or solidarity between the servant and the "we"; "he has borne our infirmities and carried our pain" (v. 4); "upon him was the punishment for our reconciliation" (v. 5bα); "he was numbered with the transgressors, . . . he made intercession for the sinners" (v. 12).

By contrast, other expressions suggest a genuine situation of substitutionary representation. In the secondary clause of a casuistic law, *nśʾ ḥēṭʾ* + suffix (Lev. 20:20; 24:15; Nu. 9:13) means "bear the consequences of *his* sin."[110] Here, however, *ḥēṭʾ rabbîm nāśāʾ* (Isa. 53:12) underscores that the servant bears the consequences of the transgressions *of others*, indeed, that he takes the entire trial of their punishment upon himself.

The expression *sbl ʿāwôn* + suffix (Isa. 53:11) otherwise occurs only in Lam. 5:7, where the Israelites must bear the *ʿāwôn* of their ancestors. The term *ʿāwôn* is comprehensive, and includes sin, punishment, and guilt.[111] The author here is obviously also

---

109. Cf. also Gerleman, 59.
110. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 259 n. 38.
111. R. Knierim, "עָוֹן *ʿāwōn* perversity," *TLOT*, II, 862-66.

thinking of *nś' 'āwôn,* which describes substitutionary representation with regard to guilt, at least in Lev. 16:22 (the scapegoat)[112] and Ex. 28:38 (Aaron) and with regard to punishment itself in Nu. 14:33.

In Isa. 53:5 *ûḇaḥᵃḇurāṯô nirpā'-lānû* introduces a theological corrective to the *do-ut-des* principle (Gen. 4:23f.; Ex. 21:25). The servant's stripes heal others, indeed, heal the entire body of Israel, on which nothing is without *ḥᵃḇurâ* (Isa. 1:6).

Despite syntactical difficulties, *'im-tāśîm 'āšām napšô* (53:10) states that the servant becomes → אשם *'āšām.* Like *'āwôn, 'āšām* encompasses various aspects, referring first of all to being or becoming obligated through sin, then to serving out or expiating that guilt, and finally to the means of such expiation.[113]

Without completely concurring with D. Kellermann's interpretation,[114] one cannot deny that the servant acquires a special task before Yahweh as the representative of the many and on their behalf. His death and his transfiguration underscore this special status.

The expression *nigzar mē'ereṣ ḥayyîm* (53:8) can refer to a person's physical death (cf. 1 K. 3:25-26; Ezk. 37:11b).[115] The "land of the living" contrasts with the realm of death (Job 28:13; Jer. 11:19; Ezk. 26:20; 32:23-27). The interpretation of Isa. 53:10, "he shall see his offspring, and shall prolong his days," and of 53:12[116] must take into account 53:8bα.

One thing is certain: God's actions with regard to the servant take place after the servant's death and beyond him,[117] even if this exaltation or transfiguration of the servant is not to be equated with resurrection.[118]

c. *The Identity of the Anonymous Servant.* The anonymous servant is a figure about whom others (Yahweh, "we") speak in the 3rd person. Only in 42:6-7 is he himself addressed, and only in 50:4-9a does he speak in the 1st person. The texts are interested especially in the servant's harsh fate (see above). His commission consists in passivity and identification. The servant neither announces deliverance nor leads the people (tasks that Deutero-Isaiah ascribes to the prophet or to groups within the people). As a "covenant to the people," the anonymous servant is part of Yahweh's gift to the people; as a witness, he is capable of understanding. He is the light that opens blind eyes and leads out of darkness those who are in it, since he himself has a portion in blindness. The servant's commission, to carry out Yahweh's plan on earth (42:4), is always related to a group that is not identified as Israel but rather as *gôyim, 'ām* (without suf.), *lᵉ'ummîm, 'îyîm, rabbîm,* and is described as blind, deaf, and imprisoned in darkness. Isa. 42:1-7 introduces the servant at least by way of imagery to an anonymous group. Isa. 42:18-23 addresses a group at the beginning with an imperative, and at the end

112. Cf. Elliger, *Leviticus,* 216.
113. R. Knierim, "אָשָׁם *'āšām* guilt," *TLOT,* I, 191-95.
114. → אשם *'āšām ('āshām)* (I, 435).
115. → גזר *gāzar* (II, 459-61).
116. Cf. Hermisson, *ZTK* 79 (1982) 21-24.
117. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), 265.
118. For views to the contrary, cf. H. Haag, *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja,* 193ff.

with a question; 43:8-13 describes the group more closely. In the monologue in 50:4-9a, their presence is concealed and threatening. In the "fourth song," kings appear as qualified observers, and the "we" appear as agents. The relationship between servant and group develops from that of the former being an instrument on behalf of the group (42:1-7), to participation as a blind person and as a witness (42:18-23; 43:8-13), and finally to substitutionary representation (52:13–53:12) including an association in sin, compensatory expiation in punishment, and presence in reconciliation. This identification with the group results in acceptance of suffering willed by Yahweh (42:21; 53:10), including physical suffering and spiritual blindness. The silent, representational acceptance of suffering (42:2; 53:7) distinguishes the anonymous servant in a fundamental fashion from the "persecuted righteous person" of the Psalms, from Job, from the Jeremiah of the confessions, and from *'eḇeḏ* Israel of Deutero-Isaiah.

These features along with the numerous liturgical and legal allusions in the vocabulary[119] suggest that the author wanted to present an exceptional figure and "task." Neither Israel nor any prophet (e.g., Deutero-Isaiah) nor any other OT figure exhibits all the characteristics of the anonymous servant. The anonymous servant is an open theological image not completely coincidental with any historical figure, neither with an individual nor with a collective, and yet is one that allows anyone who takes on his features to actualize this figure at least partially. These texts thus present themselves as a theological and dramatized mediation on the fate of every human being and on every person's ability to deal with both unavoidable suffering and temptation by taking them on both along with others and to a certain extent also for others. Israel does not seem to have any privileged relationship with the anonymous servant. Rather, the latter appears as the model for a wider circle that also includes Israel. The use of *'eḇeḏ* for Israel, too, instead underscores its difference from the anonymous servant.

The texts regarding the anonymous servant share numerous expressions with the corpus of Deutero-Isaiah and fit harmoniously into that corpus.[120] Although this may well also support the thesis of a single author for the entirety of Isa. 40–55, it does not allow one to eliminate the theological uniqueness of the statements regarding the anonymous servant.

Simian-Yofre

No consensus exists in scholarship regarding the identity of the "anonymous servant." After B. Duhm isolated the four servant songs (including 49:1-4), they were generally viewed as secondary within the overall context of Deutero-Isaiah.[121] Objections to this view have continued, however, insisting that the songs are an integral part of the book of Deutero-Isaiah.[122]

---

119. L. G. Rignell, *VT* 3 (1953) 89; R. J. Thompson, *Penitence and Sacrifice in Early Israel Outside the Levitical Law* (Leiden, 1963), 224.

120. Most recently Mettinger, *Farewell,* 18-28.

121. *Jesaja. HKAT* III/1 (1902; [5]1968), in loc.

122. Concerning the history of scholarship, see most recently H. Haag, *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja,* 15-24.

All this has encouraged the collective interpretation of the servant as Israel after a number of individual interpretations seemed to have failed (the servant as Moses, Hezekiah, Jeremiah, or the prophet himself). Those who support a messianic interpretation include G. von Rad, who sees in the servant the new Moses who will lead the new exodus, and G. Gerleman, who sees in him the new David.[123]

O. Kaiser directs attention to the royal features of the servant (election, calling in the womb, the gift of the Spirit, responsibility for justice, deliverance of the imprisoned) and finds structural similarity between 49:1-4 and Ps. 2, a royal psalm. Because the OT nowhere else attests anything like representative suffering on the part of the king, the servant's suffering in ch. 53 presents problems. I. Engnell's reference to certain Tammuz songs is unpersuasive; these songs are now understood differently.[124] Parallels in a certain sense might include several psalms that treat the theme "through death to life" and portray the petitioner as despised, suffering, dying, and revivified.[125] These psalms can be associated only indirectly with the king, however, and it is doubtful whether they actually constitute an independent group.[126] The royal features that are indeed present might be explained by the fact that the anonymous servant is actually (the ideal) Israel, described here with the aid of royal categories.[127] According to Deutero-Isaiah, Israel has, after all, assumed the role of the king (cf. Isa. 55:3-5).[128] No conclusive resolution seems possible at this time.

IV. *ʿᵃḇōḏâ.*

1. *Work.* The term *ʿᵃḇōḏâ* refers to "work" in the general sense and to work as secular or cultic "service." It occurs frequently in the *figura etymologica ʿāḇaḏ ʿᵃḇōḏâ,* "perform work."[129] The reference can be to "hard service" (Ex. 1:14; 6:9), to "the work of bearing burdens" related to the tent of meeting (Nu. 4:47; to be distinguished from *ʿᵃḇōḏaṯ ʿᵃḇōḏâ,* cultic service in the strict sense),[130] to the work of the field (1 Ch. 27:26, *ʿᵃḇōḏaṯ hāʾᵃḏāmâ;* Ex. 1:14, *ʿᵃḇōḏâ baśśāḏeh*), normal daily work (Ps. 104:23, par. *pōʿal*), the work of the wage earner (Gen. 29:27; 30:26, Jacob for Laban), or the work of soldiers (Ezk. 29:18), indeed even the work of slaves (Lev. 25:39). The term *ʿᵃḇōḏâ* also refers to the compulsory labor the Israelites performed in Egypt (Ex. 1:14; 2:23; 5:9,11; 6:9; Dt. 26:60), which was perceived as slave labor. The service or work under a king is involved in 1 K. 12:4 (par. 2 Ch. 10:4).[131] Isa. 14:3 seems to refer to

---

123. Von Rad, *OT Theology,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans., New York, 1962-65), II, 250-62; Gerleman, 38-69.

124. Cf. J. Scharbert, "Stellvertretendes Sühneleiden in den Ebed-Jahwe-Liedern und in altorientalischen Ritualtexten," *BZ,* N.S. 2 (1958) 190-213.

125. Ringgren, *Messiah in the OT,* 63f.; ibid., *Israelite Religion* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1966), 235f.

126. I. Ljung, *Tradition and Interpretation. CB* 12 (1978).

127. Ringgren, *Israelite Religion,* 293.

128. Cf. Lindhagen, 215; also the discussion of 41:8ff. above.

129. See II.4 above.

130. Cf. J. Milgrom, "The Levitical ʿABOḎĀ," *JQR* 61 (1970/71) 132-54.

131. Cf. II.5 above.

compulsory labor under hostile nations (cf. also *ᵃḇōḏaṯ mamlāḵôṯ*, 2 Ch. 12:8). In 1 Ch. 26:30 the Hebronites are charged with overseeing the *mᵉleʼḵeṯ YHWH* and the *ᵃḇōḏaṯ hammeleḵ*. 2 Ch. 12:8 distinguishes between *ᵃḇōḏāṯî* (i.e., serving God) and *ᵃḇōḏaṯ mamlāḵôṯ;* the Israelites will be Shishak's *ᵃḇāḏîm.*[132]

God's "alien" *ᵃḇōḏâ* parallels *maᵃśeh* in Isa. 28:21 (see discussion above). The same parallelism occurs in 32:16, though here it involves the effect or "yield" of righteousness (a similar semantic development for *pᵉʻullâ*).

2. *Cultic Service.* The majority of occurrences involves cultic service. Josh. 22:27 qualifies *ᵃḇōḏaṯ YHWH* more closely as the presentation of various offerings. Nu. 8:11 defines the task of the Levites as service to Yahweh. 2 Ch. 35:10,16 is referring to the entire cultic service. Ex. 12:25f. and 13:5 call the Passover celebration an *ᵃḇōḏâ* to be "kept" *(šmr)* or "performed" *(ʻbd);* the best translation here is "cultic custom."

In many occurrences the reference is to service at the tent of meeting (Nu. 4:33,35,39,43; 8:24; 18:4,33, etc.) or at the "house of God" (1 Ch. 23:28,32; 25:6; Neh. 10:33[32]; etc.). The *kᵉlê hāᵃḇōḏâ* (1 Ch. 9:28) are the utensils used in worship. The expression *ᵃḇōḏâ waᵃḇōḏâ* (Nu. 4:47) refers to the individual cultic activities.

The term *ᵃḇōḏâ* never refers to the service to foreign gods.

V. Qumran. The Qumran writings remain largely within the parameters of OT usage. The verb is used to refer to the worship of God ("in loyalty," 1QH 17:7; 17:14) as well as of idols (1QpHab 12:13; 13:2f.; CD 5:4). CD 20:20f. differentiates between *ṣaddîq* and *rāšāʻ,* i.e., between "those who serve God and those who do not serve him." In several instances the Temple Scroll follows Deuteronomy in referring to service to other gods (11QT 54:10; 55:4,7; 59:3). In addition, *ʻāḇaḏ* also means "serve someone" (62:8, from Dt. 20:11), and can be used in the expression denoting the "unworked" (untilled) field from Dt. 21:4 (11QT 63:2). With *bᵉ*, it can mean "use [cattle] for work" (11QT 52:8; cf. Dt. 15:19), and with "to fear," "to hear," and "to hold fast" can describe the proper relationship with God (11QT 54:14).

In the *Hodayoth ʻeḇeḏ* functions as the petitioner's self-designation (5:15,28; 7:16; 9:11; 10:29; 11:30,33; 13:18; 14:8,25; 16:10,12,14,18; 17:11,23,25f.; 18:6,10; also 1QS 11:16). In 4 instances "his [God's] servants, the prophets," are mentioned (1QpHab 2:9; 7:5; 1QS 1:3; 4QpHos^{b} 2:5), and once "David, your servant" (1QM 11:2). 1QS 9:22 addresses the difference between slave and ruler *(mōšēl).* CD 12:10 prohibits the sale of a male or female slave, and similarly prohibits the chiding *(mrʼ)* of slaves (CD 11:12). 11QT 54:17 uses the expression *bêṯ ᵃḇāḏîm* in reference to Egypt.

The Temple Scroll uses *ᵃḇōḏâ* several times in the combination *kōl mᵉleʼḵeṯ ᵃḇōḏâ,* "do any kind of work" (14:10; 17:11,16; 19:8; 25:9; cf. Ex. 35:24). The Damascus Document mentions work in general (CD 10:19) and on the sabbath (10:20). The task of full members is described as *ᵃḇōḏaṯ hāʻēḏâ,* "the service of the congregation" (1QSa 1:13,19; cf. also 1:22; 2:1; CD 11:23 and 14:16 use *ʻbdt hḥbr*). Members are to

132. Concerning *mᵉleʼḵeṯ ᵃḇōḏâ,* → מלאכה *mᵉlāʼḵâ,* II.2.b (VIII, 328f.).

avoid community with outsiders "in property and work" (CD 20:7; 1QS 6:2 uses *m^e lā'ḵâ w^e māmôn*). Otherwise, *'^a ḇōḏâ* develops a broader meaning here than in the biblical texts. Thus one can speak of the service of truth (1QpHab 7:11), of vanity (*šāw,* 10:11), of righteousness (1QS 4:9; 1QH 6:19), of impurity (1QS 4:10; cf. 1QM 13:5), or of violence (1QSa 1:22). Human "deeds" (*'^a ḇōḏâ*) are grounded "on the ways" of the two spirits (1QS 3:26; cf. 1QH 1:16). In the War Scroll the word can refer to "military service" (1QM 2:9,15; cf. 1QSa 1:18). Two texts refer to serving God (*'^a ḇōḏāṯ^e ḵā,* 1QH 2:33,36). Finally, God has assigned all natural phenomena their tasks, "and they fulfill their service according to his appointment" (1QH 1:12).

VI. Judaism. In Judaism the figure of the Servant of God has drawn particular attention because of its frequent identification with the Jewish people.[133]

Ringgren

---

133. See the standard works by Loewe, Segal, Kaufmann, Friedländer, Berkovits, M. Brocke, I. Greenberg, et al. Concerning this discussion, cf. among others J. Jeremias, *TDNT,* V, 677-700; M. Rese, "Überprüfung einiger Thesen von Joachim Jeremias zum Thema des Gottesknechtes im Judentum," *ZTK* 60 (1963) 21-41; H. Haag, *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja. EdF* 233 (1985), 34-66; idem, "Der 'Gottesknecht' bei Deuterojesaja im Verständnis des Judentums," *Jud* 41 (1985) 23-36.

עָבַט *'āḇaṭ;* עֲבוֹט *'^a ḇôṭ;* עַבְטִיט *'aḇṭîṭ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. 1. Meaning; 2. Usage. III. LXX.

I.1. *Etymology.* In both Akkadian and Biblical Hebrew the word family *'^a ḇôṭ/'bṭ* involves the denomination of a verb; the term *ḫubutt(āt)u(m)/ḫubuttūtu,* also *ebuṭṭum,*

'āḇaṭ. J. Barth, *NSS;* F. Buhl, *Die socialen Verhältnisse der Israeliten* (Berlin, 1899); M. David, "Deux anciens termes bibliques pour le gage (חבל, עבוט)," *OTS* 2 (1943) 79-86; G. Eisser and J. Lewy, *Die altassyrischen Rechtsurkunden von Kültepe. MVÄG* 33, 35/1 (1930, 1935); I. B. Gottlieb, "'Abōt, 'Abīt, N'bṣn," *Bar Ilan Annual* 16 (1979) 166-70; J. C. Greenfield, "Studies in Aramaic Lexicography I," *JAOS* 82 (1962) 290-99, esp. 295f.; A. Guillaume, "Hebrew and Arabic Lexicography: A Comparative Study, II," *Abr-Nahrain* 2 (1960/61) 5-35, esp. 27; F. Horst, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes. FRLANT* 45(28) (1930) = *Gottes Recht. ThB* 12 (1961), 17-154; J. Jeremias, *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung in der späten Königszeit Israels. WMANT* 35 (1970), on Hab. 2:6; D. Leibel, "יעבטון־יערבון," *Leš* 29 (1965f.) 222-25; for further bibliography, → חבל *ḥāḇal* II *(chābhal)* (IV, 179f.).

"an (initially) interest-free loan," yields *ḫabātu(m)* II, "borrow interest-free."[1] According to J. C. Greenfield, the noun derives from Aramaic, the point of departure possibly being a Proto-Semitic verbal root *'bṭ with the meaning "bind."[2]

2. *Occurrences.* a. *In the Middle East.* Apart from the occurrences of the root *'bṭ* in Akkadian and Biblical Hebrew, it does not seem to appear in the West Semitic languages, including Ugaritic. Use of both the noun and verb in Aramaic follows biblical usage.[3]

b. *In the OT.* The noun *'ᵃḇôṭ* occurs 4 times in the OT (Dt. 24:10-13), the verb *'bṭ* twice each in the qal (15:6; 24:10) and hiphil (15:6,8). Because the piel form *yᵉ'abbᵉṭûn* in Joel 2:7 is semantically unclear and is either replaced by or derived from a homonymous root *'bṭ* II,[4] it will not be considered here. Conjectures for *'aṣṣᵉḇêḵem* in Isa. 58:3 include the qal pl. ptcp. *'ōḇᵉṭêḵem,* "your debtors."[5] One additional derivative is the hapax legomenon *'aḇṭîṭ* in Hab. 2:6, which again derives from the denominated verb *'bṭ.* J. Barth classifies the word under the "nouns with repeated radicals" of the *qaṭlil* type, and suggests as its meaning "probably 'pledge,' Hab. 2:6."[6]

II. 1. *Meaning.* The point of departure for determining the meaning of forms deriving from *'bṭ* is the term *'ᵃḇôṭ,* "pledge, security, deposit." In every case it refers to an object that the debtor either stipulates or hands over as a security pledge upon receiving a loan, and that the creditor can keep and use if the debtor is unable to repay the loan.[7]

By contrast, F. Buhl suggests that the terms *ḥᵃḇōl/'ᵃḇôṭ* always refer to the "attachment security," since he views the temporary return of a security pledge (according to Dt. 24:12f.) to be nonsense.[8] G. Eisser and J. Lewy translate Akk. *e-bu-ṭu* as "property held in trust," a translation that they derive from the circumstances presupposed in the Old Assyrian legal documents they published and that they also find appropriate for Dt. 24:10ff.[9]

Regulations governing pledges and loans occur in Dt. 24:10-13 (in Ex. 22:25[Eng. v. 26]; Dt. 24:6,17 use → חבל *ḥbl*).

Because H. A. Hoffner has already discussed loan terminology in the OT as well as

---

1. See *AHw,* I, 352, 184, 304.
2. P. 295.
3. Levy, *WTM,* III, 608.
4. For the former see J. Wellhausen, *Die kleinen Propheten* (Berlin, ⁴1963), 207; F. Horst, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. HAT* I/14 (³1964), 61. For the latter see *HAL,* II, 778; Lisowsky; similarly also Greenfield, 295 n. 51.
5. *HAL,* II, 778.
6. *NSS,* §144, p. 115.
7. Horst, *Gottes Recht,* 92.
8. Pp. 99f.
9. *MVÄG* 33 (1930) 302d, nos. 269, 281.
10. → חבל II, *ḥāḇal (chābhal)* (IV, 179-84); → נשׂא *nāśā';* → ערב *'rb.*

the additional regulations the Mishnah offers concerning pledges and sureties, this need not be addressed at length here.[10]

An understanding of the verb *ʿbṭ* can profit from taking as a point of departure (with *HAL*) the concept of "entering into a pledge relationship," since this explains why *ʿbṭ* in Dt. 15:6 means "loan," and in Dt. 24:10 (with the acc. *ʿᵃḇōṭ*) means "accept a pledge."[11] These involve two different legal-financial measures, both of which are summarized under the concept of the pledge.

2. *Usage.* Beyond the legal regulations formulated using *ḥbl* concerning pledges and loans, the keyword *ʿᵃḇôṭ* is used in prohibiting the creditor from getting the pledged object from the debtor's house himself; rather, he must wait before the house for the pledge to be handed over.[12] The instructions given in Ex. 22:25 concerning the return of a cloak pledged during the day to a poor fellow citizen for the night are repeated in Dt. 24:12,13, using the noun *ʿᵃḇôṭ*.

The statement in Dt. 15:6 is noteworthy. Here the verbs *ʿbṭ* and → משל I *mšl* are parallel. A loan relationship always involves dependency, especially when the collection of interest becomes an oppressive burden (unlike with members of one's own people; cf. Ex. 22:24b; Dt. 23:20; Ps. 15:5; Ezk. 18:8,17).[13] The following sentences issue the urgent appeal not to deny the poor[14] among one's people the requisite aid (Dt. 15:8, *haʿᵃḇēṭ taʿᵃḇîṭennû*). Although here, too, the reference is naturally also to loaning against pledges, one should nonetheless deal leniently with the poor of one's own people as stipulated by Dt. 24:10,13.

While the translation as "pledge" is certain for the noun *ʿᵃḇôṭ*, the understanding of *ʿaḇṭîṭ* in Hab. 2:6 has been subject to various interpretations. F. Horst understands this as the "pledged debt" the Assyrians have from other nations.[15] By contrast, J. Jeremias finds in Hab. 2:6 a cry of woe over the wealthy commensurate with prophetic social criticism.[16] Because the wealthy oppress the small farmers through harsh pledges that do not even spare the debtor's vital necessities, they are in danger of provoking a debtor's rebellion (he considers Hab. 2:8 to be a later interpretation).

III. LXX. The LXX usually renders *ʿbṭ* with *daneízein,* and *ʿᵃḇôṭ* with *enéchyron* (once with *himátion*). Finally, it translates *ʿaḇṭîṭ* with *kloiós.*

Beyse

---

11. *HAL,* II, 778.

12. Cf. the discussion in Mishnah *B. Meṣ.* 9.13 concerning whether the court's servant may enter the house in order to get the pledge.

13. According to R. de Vaux, *AncIsr,* 171, interest rates in the ancient Near East ranged from 12 to 50 percent!

14. → אביון *ʾeḇyôn (ʾebhyôn)* (I, 27-41).

15. *Zwölf Kleinen Propheten,* 181.

16. *Kultprophetie und Gerichtsverkündigung,* 70.

עָבַר *ʿāḇar;* **עֵבֶר** *ʿēḇer;* **עֲבָרָה** *ʿᵃḇārâ;* **מַעֲבָר** *maʿᵃḇār;* **מַעְבָּרָה** *maʿbārâ;* **עֲבָרִים** *ʿᵃḇārîm;* **עֲבַר נַהֲרָא** *ʿᵃḇar nahᵃrāʾ*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. Extrabiblical Occurrences: 1. Egyp. *ʿpy;* 2. Canaanite Inscriptions; 3. Ugarit; 4. Akk. *ebēru.* III. OT: 1. Occurrences, Linguistic Peculiarities, Synonyms; 2. The Verb *ʿbr* (Qal and Hiphil): a. Spatial Movement; b. Figurative Use; c. Fixed Expressions, *Termini technici;* d. Theological Use; 3. *ʿēḇer;* 4. *ʿᵃḇārâ;* 5. *maʿᵃḇār;* 6. *maʿbārâ;* 7. *ʿᵃḇārîm;* 8. *ʿᵃḇar nahᵃrāʾ.* IV. Qumran. V. LXX.

I. Etymology. The etymology of *ʿbr* is uncertain. Although a relationship with → *ʿiḇrî* is occasionally suggested, this is not likely.[1] The same applies to the suspected connection with → *ʿeḇrâ,* "overflow > wrath."[2] J. Barth is probably more accurate in associating *ʿeḇrâ* with Arab. *ġbr;* cf. *iġbirār,* "rancor, resentment."[3] This suggests starting from two independent roots. The first is *ʿbr* II, "be angry," under which one may classify the nominal derivatives *ʿeḇrâ* I, "anger, wrath," and *ʿeḇrâ* II, "surge, excess" (Prov. 21:24; 22:8; Isa. 16:6; Jer. 48:30),[4] and presumably also *ʿbr* piel with the meaning "deliver semen, mount" (Job 21:10),[5] and hithpael, "get excited, surge up, flare up"

ʿāḇar. B. Gemser, "Beʿēber hajjardēn: In Jordan's Borderland," *VT* 2 (1952) 349-55; R. Kümpel, "Die 'Begegnungstradition' von Mamre," *Bausteine biblischer Theologie. FS G. J. Botterweck. BBB* 50 (1977), 147-68; D. Leibel, "עבר בשלח," *Tarbiz* 33 (1963/64) 225-27; J. P. U. Lilley, "By the River-Side," *VT* 28 (1978) 165-71; G. S. Ogden, "Qoheleth XI 7–XII 8: Qoheleth's Summons to Enjoyment and Reflection," *VT* 34 (1984) 27-38, esp. 32f.; M. A. van den Oudenrijn, "ʿĒber Hayyardēn," *Bibl* 35 (1954) 138; L. Prijs, "Ergänzungen zum talmudisch-hebräischen Wörterbuch," *ZDMG* 120 (1970) 6-29, esp. 20f.; C. Rabin, "Lexical Remarks," *Studies in Bible and the Ancient Near East. FS S. E. Loewenstamm,* 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1978), 397-407; Y. Ratosh, "'עבר' במקרא או ארץ העברים,'" *BethM* 16/4 (1972) 549-68; W. H. Simpson, "Divine Wrath in the Eighth Century Prophets" (diss., Boston University, 1968); N. H. Snaith, "Time in the OT," *Promise and Fulfilment. FS S. H. Hooke* (Edinburgh, 1963), 175-86; H.-P. Stähli, "עבר *ʿbr* to pass by, pass over," *TLOT,* II, 832-35; E. Vogt, "ʿēber hayyardēn = Regio finitima Iordani," *Bibl* 34 (1953) 118-19; N. M. Waldman, "On הפליג, עבר, and Akkadian Parallels," *Gratz College Annual of Jewish Studies* 2 (1973) 6-8; M. Weinfeld, "Burning Babies in Ancient Israel: A Rejoinder to Morton Smith's Article in *JAOS* 95 (1975), 477-479," *UF* 10 (1978) 411-13; H. Yalon, "ללשון המשנה," *Tarbiz* 37 (1967/68) 131-34; E. Zolli, "Sintesi delle note esegetiche," *Sefarad* 20 (1960) 295-318.

1. See, e.g., R. Borger, "Das Problem der ʿapīru (ʾḪabiru)," *ZDPV* 74 (1958) 121-32; cf., e.g., J. Lewy, "Origin and Significance of the Biblical Term 'Hebrew,'" *HUCA* 28 (1957) 1-13.

2. E.g., E. König, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum AT* (Leipzig, 1910; [5]1931), 312.

3. Barth, *Etymologische Studien zum semitischen insbesondere zum hebräischen Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1893), 5; Wehr, 595; J. A. Emerton, "Notes on Jeremiah 12:9 and Some Suggestions of J. D. Michaelis about the Hebrew Words *naḥā, ʿæbrā,* and *jadāʿ,*" *ZAW* 81 (1969) 189.

4. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans.; Minneapolis, 1997), 146; *HAL,* II, 782; a different view is taken by *GesB,* 561; O. Grether and J. Fichtner, *TDNT,* V, 392 n. 62; G. Sauer, *TLOT,* II, 835f.

5. A different view is taken by *GesB,* 559; *HAL,* 780.

(Prov. 14:16; 20:2; cf. Sir. 5:7; 7:10,16; 38:9).[6] It is questionable whether Old Aram. *y'brnh* derives from *'br* II.[7] The second, *'br* I, refers in general to a purposeful change of location or position from A to B. The position of the speaker defines the course of this movement as going or coming away from, by, or toward the speaker. This yields a plethora of semantic aspects in both the literal and the figurative sense. This root, *'br* I, is attested in all Semitic languages: Akk. *ebēru,* Ugar. *'br,* Can. *'br,* OSA and Arab. *'br;* cf. Eth. *'adawa* and Egyp. *'py.*[8]

II. Extrabiblical Occurrences.

1. *Egyp. 'py.* Egyp. *'py* is frequently attested in royal tombs beginning with the Pyramid Texts. With a direct object, it means "cross (a river), go through (a place)"; with *ḥr,* "enter (a room), go through (a gate), traverse a path"; with *m,* "enter, step into, climb into (a ship)"; with *mḫt,* "walk behind a person, follow after." It functions occasionally as a variant of *'ḳ,* "enter." Most of the occurrences of *'py* are found in the so-called books of the underworld (mortuary literature, Amduat, Book of Gates, Litany of the Sun), which guided the deceased to his or her goal: becoming one with Osiris. The path to this goal is difficult and full of danger, and the deceased must first of all *cross over* the river of the underworld. To that end, the deceased must engage the services of the ill-natured ferryman or, a better choice, make her or his own boat in the "shipyard of the gods."[9] Thus does the deceased arrive at the "gate of the primal waters" *through* which she or he must *pass* in order to *enter* the realm of the underworld. This realm is divided into seven or twenty-one sections closed off by mighty gates.[10] These gates are guarded by frightening, knife-wielding demons "whom no one wants to *pass by* for fear of their torment." Unfortunately, the deceased must *pass through* all these gates on the way to perfection, and must *cross through* all spheres of the underworld. Only the pharaoh knows the threatening guards and "*passes by them* in peace" (Amduat). The cyclical nocturnal course of the sun god is significant for the bodies of the deceased and for all the creatures of the underworld. When the light of the shining sun reaches the rigid mummies in their crypts, they are awakened and filled with breath. When at the next course the sun god continues on further, everything reverses and all creatures fall back moaning into the sleep of death. "They shout to Re, wailing to the great god/After he has *passed* them./When he is gone, darkness envelopes them,/And their pits are sealed above them."[11]

---

6. Cf. the comms. by N. Peters and R. Smend on Sir. 5:7.

7. *KAI,* 224:17; cf. *DNSI,* II, 821. See R. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik der Inschriften des 10.-8. Jhs. v. Ch.* (1969; ²1978), 68.

8. See *AHw,* I, 182; *CAD,* E, 10-13; *WUS,* no. 1990; J. C. de Moor, *The Seasonal Pattern in the Ugaritic Myth of Ba'lu According to the Version of Ilumilku. AOAT* 16 (1971), 156; *DNSI,* II, 821f.; Biella, 350f.; Wehr, 529; *LexLingAeth,* 1011; *WbÄS,* I, 179.

9. Amduat, 99, "*Fetching* the Ferry"; 136a.

10. Amduat, 144, 145.

11. Amduat, citation after E. Hornung, *The Valley of the Kings* (Eng. trans., New York, 1990), 141.

2. *Canaanite Inscriptions.* Among the many occurrences of *'br* in the Canaanite inscriptions, figurative meanings predominate.

KAI, 27, the Arslan Tash inscription (7th century B.C.), reads: "To the flier (who) (dwells?) in a dark chamber: pass by, step by step(?), LLY!" (ll. 19f.). Here *'br* means "overlook, not pay attention to, spare."

KAI, 224:16f., a Sefire inscription (8th century B.C.), reads: *lkl 'lhy 'dy' zy bspr' znh whn yrb br[y] zy yšb 'l khs'y ḥd 'ḥwh 'w y'brnh ltšlḥ.* The form *y'brnh* is probably 3rd person masc. sg. impf. haphel with a 3rd person masc. sg. suffix *(nun energicum):* "he removes, i.e., he eliminates him" (cf. 2 Ch. 15:8; Jon. 3:6; Zec. 13:2). The syntactical relationships of the phrase are not entirely clear, but two possibilities emerge. First, *ḥd 'ḥwh* is the subject of *yšb* and *y'brnh,* and *zy yšb* is a causal statement: "and if my son has a legal dispute because one of his brothers wants to set himself on my throne or wants to eliminate him." Second, *bry* is the subject of *y'brnh,* and *zy yšb* the attributive clause: "and if my son, who sits on my throne, has a legal dispute (with) one of his brothers or wants to eliminate him." In either case, difficulties remain.

KAI, 256:6f. (1st/2nd century A.D.) uses an unusual metaphor: "And prayer to 'our Lord' for every one among all human beings who *l'bwr b-gwph.*" The term *gwph* corresponds to Heb. "corpse," *l'bwr* is 3rd person sg. masc. impf. qal with preformative *l:* "pass over into his corpse = die."

KAI, 215:18 (8th century B.C.) uses *'br* haphel, "bring over," in the sense of "lead, guide (a corpse) over": *whqm lh msky b'rḥ wh'br 'by mn dmsq l'swr,* "and he set up for him a monument along the way and led my father over from Damascus to Assur."

The interpretation of *'brtm* in *KAI,* 162:4 is uncertain; "you impregnated her" (?); cf. *'br* II.

3. *Ugarit.* Very few occurrences of *'br* have been noted for Ugarit.[12] According to *KTU,* 1.3, VI, El, who wants to secure a dwelling for Ba'al, dispatches emissaries to the god's master-builder Kušaru-Ḫasisu in Kaphtor. El sends two messengers of the goddess Asherah with the commission: *('b)r gbl 'br q'l 'br 'ht np šmm šmšr ldgy aṯrt mǵ lqdš amrr* (7-11): "Traverse Gabal, traverse Qa'al, traverse Ihat-nop-shamem. Proceed, O Fisherman of Asherah, Go, O Qadesh wa-Amrur!" Here *'br* is used in its basic meaning.[13]

The situation in *KTU,* 1.4, VII, 7-12 is similar, albeit with a slight nuance prompted by the context: *'br l['r] 'rm ṯb lpd[r] pdm ṯṯ lṯṯm 'ḥd 'r šb'm šb' pdr ṯmnym b'lm [ḫṣ] tš'm b'l mr:* "he marched from city to city, turned from town to town. Sixty-six cities he took, seventy-seven towns. Eighty Ba'lu beat, ninety Ba'lu expelled."[14] Ba'al's triumphal procession as described in this graded numerical saying takes the victorious warrior from city to city and into his sanctuary.

---

12. *KTU,* 1.3, VI, 7, 8 (3 times); 1.4, VII, 7 (textual emendation from *'dr* to *'br* according to de Moor, *Seasonal Pattern,* 156); 1.22, I, 15 (pl. ptcp. [bis]), 4.116, 14.

13. Cf. *KTU,* 1.22, I, 15; translation according to *ANET,* 138.

14. De Moor, *Seasonal Pattern,* 156.

4. *Akk. ebēru.* Like Heb. *'br,* Akk. *ebēru* covers a broad semantic spectrum. With a direct object it means "to cross": *ᴵᴰza'ibam e-bi-ir-ma ana māt tabrā aḫḫabit,* "I crossed the Zab and invaded the land of Tabra."[15] *Idiqlat e-te-bir ina šēp ammāte ša Idiqlat maddattu ma'attu attaḫar,* "I crossed the Tigris and received rich tribute (from the area) beyond the Tigris."[16] *U mamma ša ultu ūm ṣāt ikšudu la ib-bi-ru tâmta e-bir tâmti ᵈŠamaš qurādummu alla ᵈŠamaš ib-bir mannu,* "and none who came since the beginning of days could cross the sea. Only valiant Shamash crosses the sea; other than Shamash, who can cross (it)?" (Gilg. X, 2, 22f.).[17] *Šamê i-bi-ir ašrātum iḫîṭamma,* "[Marduk] crossed the heavens and surveyed the regions" (EnEl IV, 141).[18] Without an object *ebēru* means "pass by, go over, come by, etc.," in the figurative sense as well, and as a *terminus technicus* "extend, go beyond" in extispicy: *šumma padānu ana imitti u šumēli maqit u elītum ṣīr ḫašî ša imitti i-bir,* "if the 'path' is sunken to the right and the left, and the upper part extends beyond the back of the right lung."[19] The Š stem exhibits the causative meaning corresponding to the G stem: "cause to traverse, lead over, bring over."

Nominal derivatives include *ebertu,* which as a noun refers to the (opposite) shore or the other side (of a river): *ālam GN ina aḫ Purattim e-bi-ir-tam annītam īpuš,* "he took the city X on the shore of the Euphrates, on this shore."[20] *Ālānû kalûšunu ša e-bi-ir-tim ša māt GN,* "all cities on the other shore in the country X."[21] *Ašar inandinakku-mūši u lu ana e-be-er-ti ša a-qa-a-wa lu e-be-erta ša e-ša-a-wa ša bit PN muḫrannišu,* "take (the barley) from him wherever he gives it to you, either on (this?) side or on the (other?) side (of the river from) the house of PN."[22] Apparently *ebertu* refers only in Mesopotamia to the "other/opposite shore/side," while in Mari, Boghazköy, and Nuzi it refers only to the shore to which the specification "this side/ the other side" is referring. As a preposition *ebertu* means "beyond, opposite"; cf. the advs. *eberta* and *ebertān.*[23]

The expression *eber nāri* represents a fixed geographical term referring in a late text (possibly) to a specific region beyond the Euphrates near Babylon and Uruk: *mērištu ša eber nāri.*[24] Otherwise it refers to the land west of the Euphrates, "Transpotamia" (i.e., Trans-Euphrates, called in the OT "Beyond the River"), Syria: *šarrâni mât Ḫatti u e-ber nâri,* "the kings of the land of the Hittites and of 'Transpotamia,'"[25] i.e., of Tyre, Judah, Edom, Moab, Gaza, Ashkelon, Ekron, Byblos, Arvad, Samsimuruna, Ammon, and Ashdod; cf. *Gubarra LÚ piḫat Bābili u KUR e-ber nāri,* "Gubarra, the gover-

15. *RA,* 7, 155, II, 15.
16. E. Budge and L. King, *The Annals of the Kings of Assyria,* 346, III, 1.
17. Translation according to *ANET,* 91.
18. Translation according to *ANET,* 67.
19. *TCL,* 6 5, 45; *CAD,* IV, 12.
20. *ARM,* II, 131, 12.
21. *ARM,* II, 131, 31.
22. *HSS,* 9.5 12, 14.
23. *CAD,* IV, 8f.
24. *YOSR,* 7.63 3, 5.
25. R. Borger, *Die Inschriften Asarhaddons. BAfO* 9 (1956), 60, §27, episode 21 A, V 54.

nor of Babylon and 'Transpotamia.'"[26] The expression *eber nāri* is found first in Esarhaddon; all remaining occurrences are early Achaemenid.

III. OT.

1. *Occurrences, Linguistic Peculiarities, Synonyms.* The verb *'br* occurs altogether 547 times.[27] Statistically, the verb is distributed rather evenly across the entire OT.

The qal occurs 465 times:[28] 20 occurrences in Genesis; 12 in Exodus; 2 in Leviticus (26:6; 27:32); 31 in Numbers; 46 in Deuteronomy; 53 in Joshua; 23 in Judges; 21 in 1 Samuel; 39 in 2 Samuel; 10 in 1 Kings; 14 in 2 Kings; 34 in Isaiah; 25 in Jeremiah (including 2:20 *Q; K: 'bd*); 22 in Ezekiel; 3 in Hosea (6:7; 8:11; 10:11); 1 in Joel (4:17); 6 in Amos; 1 in Jonah (2:4); 6 in Micah; 4 in Nahum; 2 in Habbakuk (1:11; 3:10); 3 in Zephaniah (2:2,15; 3:6); 4 in Zechariah; 25 in the Psalms; 15 in Job; 11 in Ecclesiastes; 2 in Ruth (2:8; 4:1); 5 in Canticles; 4 in Lamentations; 5 in Esther; 3 in Daniel (9:11; 11:11,40); 3 in Nehemiah (2:14[bis]; 9:11); 3 in 1 Chronicles (12:16[Eng. v. 15]; 19:17; 29:30); 6 in 2 Chronicles. The niphal occurs once (Ezk. 47:58), and the piel once (1 K. 6:21).[29] The hiphil occurs 80 times: 3 times in Genesis (8:1; 32:24[23]; 47:21); 3 in Exodus (13:12; 33:19; 36:6); 3 in Leviticus (18:21; 25:9[bis]); 6 in Numbers; 2 in Deuteronomy (2:30; 18:10); 3 in Joshua (4:3,8; 7:7); 5 in 1 Samuel; 9 in 2 Samuel (including 19:41 *Q*); 1 in 1 Kings (15:12); 4 in 2 Kings; 3 in Jeremiah (15:14; 32:35; 46:17); 13 in Ezekiel (including 48:14 *Q*).

Nominal derivatives of *'br* include: *'ēḇer* with 90 occurrences: 2 in Genesis (50:10,11); 4 in Exodus; 7 in Numbers; 12 in Deuteronomy; 24 in Joshua (including 22:7 *Q*); 4 in Judges; 7 in 1 Samuel; 1 in 2 Samuel (10:16); 7 in 1 Kings; 4 in Isaiah; 3 in Jeremiah (25:12; 48:28; 49:32); 3 in Ezekiel (1:9,12; 10:22); 1 in Zephaniah (3:10); 1 in Job (1:19); 1 in Ezra (8:36); 3 in Nehemiah (2:7,9; 3:7); 4 in 1 Chronicles; 1 in 2 Chronicles (20:2); *'ᵃḇārâ* with 2 occurrences (2 S. 15:28 [*K*]; 19:19); *ma'ᵃḇār* with 3 occurrences (Gen. 32:23[22]; 1 S. 13:23; Isa. 30:32); *ma'bārâ* with 8 occurrences (Josh. 2:7; Jgs. 3:28; 12:5,6; 1 S. 14:4; Isa. 10:29; 16:2; Jer. 51:32); also the place-name *'ᵃḇārîm* in Nu. 27:12; 33:47f.; Dt. 32:49; cf. Ezk. 39:11; Aram. *'ᵃḇar nahᵃrā'* with 14 occurrences in Ezra (4:10f.,16f.,20; 5:3,6; 6:6,8,13; 7:21,25; cf. Akk. *eber nāri*).[30]

Various synonyms are found within the narrower and broader context of *'br*. Parallels to *'br* qal include *gûz*, "pass by" (Nu. 11:31; Ps. 90:10); *ḥlp* I, "continue on, pass by, go away, pass away" (Job 9:11; Cant. 2:11; Isa. 8:8; 24:5; Hab. 1:11); *'tq*, "go further, advance, age" (Job 14:18; 18:4; 21:7; Ps. 6:8[7]); *klh*, "be over, at an end" (Jer. 8:20); *mûṯ*, "die" (Job 34:20). Parallels to *'br* hiphil include *sûr* hiphil, "remove" (Zec. 3:4); *nāśā' peša'*, "take away iniquities" (Job 7:21). Finally, general verbs of motion

26. A. Pohl, *Neubabylonische Rechtsurkunden aus den Berliner Staatlichen Museen. AnOr* 8 (1933), 45, 4.
27. Stähli, 832, counts 548.
28. *HAL*, II, 779.
29. Concerning Job 21:10, which some cite as a piel, see I above (*'br* II).
30. See II.4 above.

frequently parallel *'br:* → הלך *hlk* (e.g., Am. 6:2); → בוא *bô'* (e.g., Am. 5:5); → נגע *ng'*, "reach as far as, extend to" (Jer. 48:32; cf. 1 S.14:1).

2. *The Verb 'br (Qal and Hiphil).* The verb *'br* refers in a very general sense to a change of location or position. The only connotation seems to be that the movement in question is purposeful or goal-oriented. This indefinite quality attaching to the root enables it to pick up various contextual specifications and thus to represent a great many semantic aspects.

a. *Spatial Movement.* The first meanings to be noted are those expressing spatial movement. Both the manner and the goal of such movement are determined by the use of prepositions and objects.

(1) *Go on one's way, pass through.* According to Gen. 12:6, Abram passes through the land to the oracular oak at Shechem. Jacob passes through the flocks of his relative in order to sort out suitable animals (Gen. 30:32). Jgs. 11:29 relates that Jephthah "passed through Gilead and Manasseh. He passed on to Mizpah of Gilead, and from Mizpah of Gilead he passed on to the Ammonites." The course of a boundary extending as it were from place to place is described with *'br* (Josh. 15:6,7,10,11; 16:2,6; 18:13,18,19; 19:13).[31] Mic. 2:12f., a secondary oracle of salvation about Israel's deliverance, speaks of a pioneering figure who will "go up" before the remnant of Israel, "and they will break through and pass the gate (*'āḇar*), going out by it (*yāṣā'*)."[32] The postexilic oracle of salvation in Mic. 5:4-13(5-14) portrays the remnant of Jacob in the image of the lion who "goes through" (invades) the sheep in the pen; thus also will Israel destroy the nations. The concluding message of Trito-Isaiah (62:10-12), formulated with words from Deutero-Isaiah, addresses the inhabitants of Jerusalem: "Go through, go through the gates . . . clear it of stones," i.e., remove the obstacles still standing in the way of the exiles' return. In a lament over the devastation of the land, Isa. 33:8 states that "the highways are deserted, the streets empty [lit. 'one passing over a path ceases']." This corresponds to the prediction in the contrasting motif that "a highway shall be there, and it shall be called the Holy Way; the unclean shall not 'travel' on it" (Isa. 35:8). The later addendum, "only his people (?) may go on it," uses *hālaḵ* in parallel. According to Ps. 8:9(8), the work of creation Yahweh gives to the appointed ruler includes "whatever passes along the paths of the seas."

(2) *Go/come over (or beyond) someone or something.* One of the regulations in the nazirite vow stipulates that "all the days of their nazirite vow no razor shall come upon (*'br*) the head" (Nu. 6:5). The oracle of threat in Isa. 8:5-8 describes the people's danger as the mighty waters of the Euphrates that will overflow their banks "and will sweep on into Judah as a flood, and, pouring over, it will reach up to the neck" (v. 8).[33]

---

31. Cf. O. Bächli, "Von der Liste zur Beschreibung," *ZDPV* 89 (1973) 6.

32. → עלה *'ālâ;* cf. T. Lescow, "Redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse von Micha 1–5," *ZAW* 84 (1972) 46-85.

33. Concerning the reading *šāṭōp̄ weʿāḇōr,* cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), 340f.

In bemoaning the people's depravity and the considerable part played in it by the prophets (Jer. 23:9-15), the prophet describes his own consternation in the image of a man overcome *(ʿāḇar)* by wine (v. 9). The description of misery in Jon. 2:3-10(2-9), a secondarily inserted thanksgiving hymn, mentions that all the waves of the sea have passed over the petitioner (v. 4[3]). By contrast, the petitioner in Ps. 88 laments before Yahweh that the heat of Yahweh's wrath has swept over him (v. 17[16]). Finally, the lament on transience in Ps. 103:14-16 describes human fate in the image of a flower of the field over which the wind[34] passes *(ʿāḇar),* "and it is gone."

(3) *Go over, hither, cross over, continue on.* The verb *ʿāḇar* also refers to crossing a river. After outwitting Laban, Jacob secretly makes off with all his property and crosses the Euphrates in heading toward Gilead (Gen. 31:21). On the way to his brother Esau, he crosses the ford of the Jabbok (32:23[22]). Most (about one-third) of the occurrences exhibiting this meaning involve the Jordan,[35] and not surprisingly *ʿāḇar* then also refers to crossing a border. As a visible sign of their agreement, Jacob and Laban erect a stone heap and assure one another "that I will not pass beyond this heap to you, and you will not pass beyond this heap and this pillar to me, for harm" (31:52). The perhaps secondary insertion[36] of Jer. 5:22-25 into the great chiding discourse 5:1-31 reminds the recalcitrant and rebellious people of the boundary Yahweh placed before the sea of chaos; its wild raging notwithstanding, the sea cannot cross over this boundary and destroy the regular course of the fixed order of nature.

Without any direct object, *ʿāḇar* means "go (over) to." Jonathan tells his armor bearer, "Come, let us go over to the Philistine garrison on the other side *(mēʿēḇer)*" (1 S. 14:1). After sparing Saul's life again, David goes over *(ʿāḇar)* to the other side *(hāʿēḇer)* of the valley to maintain sufficient distance between Saul and himself (1 S. 26:13). After the bloodbath Ishmael brings upon Gedaliah and his followers (Jer. 41:1-3,8,10-15), "he set out *(hālaḵ)* to cross over *(ʿāḇar)* to the Ammonites" (41:10). Jgs. 9:26 has the opposite perspective: "Gaal son of Ebed came *(bôʾ)* with his kinsfolk, and they came over *(ʿāḇar)* into Shechem [i.e., they settled in Shechem]." The reproach in Jer. 2:9-11 demands that Israel "cross to the coasts of Cyprus and look, send *(šlḥ* piel) to Kedar and examine with care" (2:10) whether any nation in the east or in the west has ever exchanged its gods for helpless beings that are no gods at all. The use of *ʿāḇar* is similar in Am. 6:2, an expansion in the style of a disputation of the prophetic cry of woe against Samaria's upper classes (vv. 1,3-6a): "Cross over *(ʿāḇar)* to Calneh [cf. Isa. 10:9], and see; from there go *(hālaḵ)* to Hamath the great; then go down *(yāraḏ)* to Gath of the Philistines. Are you better than these kingdoms?" Amos's pupil underscores the self-confidence and carefreeness denounced in the basic saying and actualizes it for his own generation.

(4) *Go further, overtake, precede, go ahead, follow behind, pass under something.* Prov. 22:3 says that "the clever see danger and hide; but the simple go on, and suffer

---

34. → רוח *rûaḥ.*

35. See III.2.d.(4) below.

36. P. Volz, *Der Prophet Jeremia. KAT* X (^{2}1928), 66. A different view is taken by J. Schreiner, *Jeremia. NEB* (1981), 46.

for it" (cf. Prov. 27:12). The messengers dispatched to bring David the news of Absalom's death are racing. Ahimaaz overtakes the Cushite and reaches David first (2 S. 18:23). With the preps. *lip̄nê* and *'aḥarê,* the verb *ʿāḇar* means "go ahead" and "follow behind," synonymous with the corresponding constructions with *hālaḵ.* Anticipating meeting his brother, Jacob sends servants ahead with flocks as gifts and tells them to "pass on ahead of me" (Gen. 32:17[16]). Immediately before the meeting, Jacob goes to the head of his retinue and proceeds toward Esau (33:3). After what is for Jacob a favorable conclusion to the meeting, he asks his brother to "pass on ahead of [your] servant . . . until I come to my lord in Seir" (33:14). According to Ex. 17:5, Yahweh issues the order for Moses to "go on ahead of the people, and take some of the elders of Israel with you." In 1 S. 9:27 Samuel wishes to deliver a divine oracle to Saul, and so has him tell his servant boy to "go on before us." According to 2 K. 4:31, Gehazi goes ahead of the prophet Elisha to ascertain the condition of the Shunammite's sick child. In order to pursue Sheba, who has rebelled against David, those loyal to David gather around Joab and follow after him (*ʿāḇar 'aḥarê,* 2 S. 20:13). The same situation is then also expressed with *bô' 'aḥarê* when the Bichrites assemble around Sheba and follow after him (2 S. 20:14). In connection with tithes from herds and flocks, *ʿāḇar* with the prep. *taḥaṯ* means "pass through (under the shepherd's staff)" (Lev. 27:32). Together with *ʿbr* hiphil in Ezk. 20:37, this describes the selection of those who will belong to the new covenant with Yahweh.

b. *Figurative Use.* The figurative use of *ʿāḇar* is closely connected with the meanings discussed in the preceding section on spatial movement.

(1) *Pass by, elapse.* Forty days elapse during the embalming of Jacob-Israel (Gen. 50:4). After the time of mourning has passed, David brings Uriah's wife into his own house (2 S. 11:27). According to 1 K. 18:29, the prophets of Baʿal fall into ecstatic raving as midday passes by. Harvest passes by (Jer. 8:20 par. *kālâ,* "come to an end"). The oracle of judgment from one of Amos's pupils (Am. 8:4-7) has the exploiters ask "when will the new moon be over . . . and the sabbath" so that they can engage in business activities again (v. 5). The small poem in Cant. 2:10-13 praises the commencement of new joy in life and love in the image of nascent springtime, proclaiming that "the winter is past *(ʿāḇar),* the rain is over and gone *(ḥālap̄)*" (v. 11). 11QT 63:15 expands the regulations of Dt. 21:10-14 by insisting that a prisoner of war taken as a wife may touch what is pure only after seven years "have elapsed" *(ʿāḇar).*

(2) *Seep away, run dry, go out.* In Job's lament over his friends (Job 6:14-30), the poet compares them with water freshets that seep away *(ʿāḇar)* and disappear when it is hot (*ṣāmaṯ* niphal, vv. 15,17). According to Zophar's instructions, if Job will but direct his heart rightly, i.e., acknowledge and confess his sin, he will forget all his misery as if it were water that seeps away or runs dry (11:16; cf. Ps. 58:8[7] par. *hālaḵ*). According to Est. 1:19, the king is to issue an edict against Vashti that will never be extinguished, i.e., will be irrevocable. After the plan to annihilate the Jews has been foiled, the Jews celebrate the Feast of Purim; "nor should the commemoration of these days be extinguished among their descendants," i.e., be forgotten (Est. 9:28).

(3) *Scatter, disperse.* The apocalyptically influenced oracle of salvation in Isa. 29:1-

8 compares the strangers *(zārîm)*[37] with small dust, and the multitude of tyrants with flying, dispersing chaff. The threat in Jer. 13:24 applies this image to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Because their depravity is incurable (cf. the preceding reproach, 13:23), Yahweh will scatter them like chaff driven by the wind. The oracle of reproach in Zeph. 2:1-3 summons the indifferent people to assemble before they drift away like chaff and Yahweh's fierce anger comes upon them (v. 2). Finally, the lament over transiency in Ps. 144:4 compares the days of life with a passing shadow.

(4) *Pass away, die.* In his description of misery in Job 17:11-16, the poet says that his own days are past (v. 11). Within the context of v. 13 ("Sheol is my house"), this can only mean that he sees the end of his life coming. Elihu counters Job's assertion that God is treating him unjustly by adducing God's immutable righteousness and his power to actualize that righteousness. At God's command the mighty die *(mûṯ)* in a moment, and the nobles pass away (*ʿāḇar,* 34:20). Hence when God visits misery upon a person, he does so to bring about repentance and to keep the person from perishing (33:18). After successful repentance, through the intercession of the mediator, God sends the person new life, and the pardoned sinner can praise God, saying, "he has kept my soul from dying [emended text], and my life shall see the light" (v. 28). One view understands the expression *ʿāḇar baššelaḥ* with reference to Ugar. *šlḥ,* to mean "run into the javelin," another (probably more correctly) to mean "to cross the river of the underworld."[38]

(5) *Overflow.* In portraying the (apparent) good fortune of the wicked, Ps. 73:3-12 points out that their hearts overflow with evil plans (v. 7). By contrast, the petitioner in Ps. 17:3 insists that he has done no wrong, nor has his mouth overflowed with wickedness.

(6) *Escape, elude.* In the conclusion to the disputation in Isa. 40:12-31, the divine discourse cites rhetorically and in indirect discourse the exiles' lament: "My way is hidden from Yahweh, and my right eludes my God" (v. 27). In descriptive praise similarly introduced in a rhetorical question, Deutero-Isaiah counters this by drawing attention to Yahweh's dominion as the creator whose unfathomable plan contains the possibility of a new future for the exiles (vv. 28-31). The prophetic announcement in Ps. 81:6-13(5-12), formulated in the style of Deuteronomistic historical preaching and judgment, contrasts Israel's stubbornness and disobedience (vv. 12-13) with Yahweh's act of deliverance at the beginning of the people's history: "I relieved your shoulder of the burden; your hands came loose *(ʿbr)* from the basket" (v. 7).

(7) *Turn away, remove (ʿbr hiphil).* In Ps. 119:37 the petitioner asks Yahweh to turn his eyes away from vanities, and to turn away the disgrace of slander through a favorable hearing. Finally, Eccl. 11:10 advises us to keep our minds from anxiety (NRSV "banish") and to enjoy the brief time of youth.

(8) *Sound, let resonate* (*ʿbr* hiphil). This meaning is evoked with the obj. *qôl,*

37. With O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 263 n. e.

38. For the former see *KBL*², 976; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 454. For the latter, M. Tsevat, "The Canaanite God Šälaḥ," *VT* 4 (1954) 43; Leibel, 226f.

"voice" (Ex. 36:6; Ezr. 1:1; 10:7; Neh. 8:15; 2 Ch. 30:5; 36:22; cf. 1 S. 2:24) and with the obj. *šôpār,* "horn" (Lev. 25:9).

c. *Fixed Expressions, Termini Technici.* Several combinations using *ʿāḇar* apparently represent fixed expressions or *termini technici.* In 3 instances the presumably old ritual for determining divine judgment in the case of suspected adultery (Nu. 5:10-31) uses the expression *ʿāḇar ʿālāw rûaḥ-qinʾâ* (vv. 14[bis],30), "the spirit of jealousy comes on him [the husband]." The exact meaning of this formulation, which variously parallels "and he becomes jealous," can no longer be determined. In Job 13:13 the expression *yaʿaḇōr ʿālay mâ,* "and let come on me what may," recalls a conditional self-imprecation. In connection with the military dispute between Saul's son Ishbaal and David, 2 S. 2:12-17 recounts representational combat between twelve elite soldiers on either side who come forward to *ʿāḇar bᵉmispār* (v. 15). Although this expression is usually rendered as "count off," this seems questionable. This presumably involves the selection of the dueling partners.[39] Isa. 23:2 describes the Sidonian merchants as "seafaring" or "sea-experienced." The expression *kesep ʿōḇēr lassōḥēr,* "(weights) acceptable to the traders," also derives from the sphere of trade, and refers either to the normal currency in a country or to the usual value.[40] Technical meaning also attaches to *ʿibbēr* (piel) in 1 K. 6:21, meaning to "draw chains of gold across a room," i.e., "decorate with."

d. *Theological Use.* Given the extremely high number of occurrences at large, *ʿbr* qal and hiphil are not used very frequently in a theological sense, though such usage can be rather subtle. Here, too, meanings follow quite closely on those discussed above (under a) in connection with spatial movement.

(1) *Pass through the fire.* Several different word combinations with *ʿbr* hiphil appear in connection with so-called child sacrifice.[41] These include *heʿᵉḇîr bāʾēš* (Nu. 31:23; Dt. 18:9f.; 2 K. 16:3 par. 2 Ch. 28:3; 2 K. 17:17; 2 K. 21:6 par. 2 Ch. 33:6; Ezk. 20:26,31); *heʿᵉḇîr lammōleḵ* (Jer. 32:35; cf. Lev. 18:21: *nāṯan* + inf. *haʿaḇîr*); *heʿᵉḇîr bāʾēš lammōleḵ* (2 K. 23:10); *heʿᵉḇîr lᵉʾoḵlâ* (Ezk. 23:37). According to Nu. 31:23, Israel is to pass through fire "everything that can withstand fire . . . and it shall be clean." This quite obviously involves some sort of cultic purification. Dt. 18:10 stipulates that "no one shall be found among you who makes a son or daughter pass through fire, or who practices divination, or is a soothsayer . . . for whoever does these things is abhorrent to Yahweh" (cf. 11QT 60:17). As in the Deuteronomistic framing sections of 2 Kings par. 2 Chronicles (see above), so also is "passing something through fire" here associated with magic, sorcery, and idolatry. This suggests that "passing something through fire" refers not to a form of child sacrifice by incineration but to some sort of consecration associated with magic.[42] Ezk. 20:26,31 confirm this suspicion. There

39. On this entire complex cf. *ANET,* 20; *AOT,* 57f.; Y. Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans., New York, 1963), 266f.

40. *HAL,* II, 779; Stähli, 833. See EÜ.

41. So most recently M. Smith, "A Note on Burning Babies," *JAOS* 95 (1975) 477-79; Stähli, 833.

42. O. Procksch, *Theologie des AT* (Gütersloh, 1950), 188, thinks this might be referring to an ordeal.

Yahweh denies his entreaty by the house of Israel by adducing their idolatry, which consists in sacrificing to foreign gods *and* in "passing their children through the fire." Ezk. 23:37 does not contradict this even if interpreters have repeatedly understood as child sacrifice the statement "they have even offered up to them for food (their) children." This is rather a drastic expression quite typical of Ezekiel that refers to Israel having alienated its own children from Yahweh, introduced them to foreign cults, and dedicated them to other gods.

Ezk. 15:4 and 6 (cf. Jer. 12:9) say that Yahweh will "give *(nāṯan)*" the vine branch (Israel) or the sword of Nebuchadnezzar "to the fire to eat." Here, too, the expression refers metaphorically to annihilation rather than to actual incineration. When Israel allows its children to go to other gods, it is surrendering them to destruction. From a form-critical perspective, Ezk. 23:37 is related to the expression *he'eḇîr lammōleḵ* in Jer. 32:35, which in its own turn is related to *he'eḇîr leYHWH* in Ex. 13:12. The text from Exodus is itself dependent on the demand that the firstborn be dedicated to Yahweh, a demand extant in several different versions in Ex. 22:28f.(29f.); 34:19f.; 13:2,12f. These texts speak about "giving *(nāṯan)* to Yahweh," "belonging to him," "dedicating/consecrating *(qiddēš)* to him," "send/have go *(he'eḇîr)* to him." Not a single case speaks of sacrificing, but rather of offering, presenting, and dedicating the firstborn child to Yahweh. The sacrifice of a firstborn animal is associated with the term *zāḇaḥ* (Ex. 13:15). Hence Jer. 32:35 is to be interpreted within the horizon of Ex. 13:12 as a gift and dedication for Moloch, from which it follows that the formulae *he'eḇîr leYHWH, he'eḇîr lammōleḵ* or *nāṯan leYHWH,* and *nāṯan lammōleḵ* (Lev. 20:2ff.) belong together form critically, and are to be viewed as synonyms. The formulations *he'eḇîr bā'ēš lammōleḵ* (2 K. 23:10) and *nāṯan leha'aḇîr lammōleḵ* (Lev. 18:21) are then secondary constructions employing existing formal elements.[43]

(2) *Enter the ranks of the conscripted.* The expression *'āḇar 'al-happequḏîm* occurs 3 times (Ex. 30:13,14; 38:26). The pass. ptcp. *pequḏîm,* "conscripts," occurs 75 times and represents a term from military and administrative language. Conscripts are those men fit for military service who are entered into conscript lists at the time of regular levies for the sake of acquiring an overview of the number available in the event of war. During the early period these were the men fit for military service who moved out for rearguard service. In Ex. 30:11-16 P picks up this older notion of the rear guard to justify a regular per-capita tax for the postexilic cultic community covering the needs of the cult (v. 16a). Even the motivation of countering the danger a census might provoke in the form of divine wrath (cf. 2 S. 24), which can be avoided only through payment of "atonement for your lives," is extremely antiquated. Accordingly, *'āḇar 'al happequḏîm* means "enter into the number of those paying the cult tax," i.e., be reckoned as a member of the cultic community. The formulation is used in this sense in Qumran.[44]

(3) *Yahweh's advance in holy war.* Twice in connection with the land conquest

43. Concerning this entire complex see D. Plataroti, "Zum Gebrauch des Wortes *mlk* im AT," *VT* 28 (1978) 286-300; → מלך *mōleḵ* (VIII, 387f.).
44. See IV below.

Yahweh is said to advance before his people and to conquer the nations. "Know then today that Yahweh your God is the one who crosses over before you as a devouring fire; he will defeat them and subdue them before you" (Dt. 9:3). Although this verse belongs to the unit 9:1-7, which in its own turn follows Dt. 7–8 both linguistically and conceptually, at the same time it introduces and provides the hermeneutical key to the narrative in 9:8–10:11, and comes from the hand of the final redactor of Dt. 5–11. The author presents the land conquest as a Yahweh war, which according to tradition is actually a legal dispute to be decided by divine judgment. The land conquest represents Yahweh's inaccessible deed and the fulfillment of his promise to the ancestors. Dt. 31:3 is also to be understood within this horizon, even if one understands it as coming from a different author. In the later Deuteronomistic strata, the understanding of Yahweh's military acts no longer has anything to do with actual political events of the day; rather, it has become a theory of God's actions quite independent of reality itself.

(4) *Through the Jordan.* The notion of crossing the Jordan became a theologoumenon in a slightly different fashion. The expression *'āḇar 'eṯ-hayyardēn* represents a formulation typical of the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic literature.[45] The literary-critical implications of the wide variety of *'āḇar* formulations, especially those in Dt. 1–34, have not yet been studied, and could well cast new light on the literary genesis of Deuteronomy. The Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic literature uses *'āḇar* as a *terminus technicus* in connection with the land conquest.[46] This explains why *'āḇar* never became part of the terminology associated with the exodus. Only P speaks of "crossing through" the sea,[47] and uses only *bô'* and *hālaḵ*. Josh. 3–5 portrays the crossing of the Jordan as an act of quasi-worship. The people are to sanctify themselves (3:5) as if in preparation for a sacred event in the temple worship service. The keyword of this textual unit is *'āḇar,* occurring 22 times, with *'āmaḏ* constituting its counterpart with 5 occurrences. This represents a clearly conceived theological narrative that intends to present the crossing of the Jordan in connection with God's great plan. That plan itself extends from the time of the patriarchs to the exodus and land conquest on into the present, and is presented as proof of Yahweh's compassionate and mighty guidance. This is why the crossing of the Jordan and the path through the Red Sea are associated theologically (4:23). This crossing marks the beginning of something entirely new; with it a salvific future commences. Thus does the crossing of the Jordan or the Red Sea become a theologoumenon and simultaneously the hermeneutical key to any crossing into a new future. This is also the implication of the actualizing "today" in Dt. 9:1 et passim. Josh. 3–5 exhibits an overall theological concept colored by Deuteronomistic thinking. This conception has in its own turn incorporated a plethora of older material that in many cases is difficult to assess.[48] At an earlier period, a wor-

---

45. Cf. H.-J. Fabry, "Spuren des Pentateuchredaktors in Jos 4,21ff.," *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft,* ed. N. Lohfink, BETL 68 (1985), 351-56, esp. 353.

46. Cf. P. Diepold, *Israels Land. BWANT* 95 (1972), 29, 57, 62; G. Braulik, *Die Mittel deuteronomischer Rhetorik erhoben aus Deuteronomium 4,1-10. AnBibl* 68 (1978), 93ff.

47. → יָם *yām* (VI, 87-98); → סוּף *sûp*.

48. Cf. G. Kuhnert, "Das Gilgalpassah" (diss., Mainz, 1981).

ship celebration may have been conducted at a sanctuary such as that at Gilgal during which the crossing of the Jordan was cultically evoked.[49] The specifics of this celebration are obscure. In any event the celebration reflected in Josh. 3–5 does resonate in Ps. 114 (cf. Ex. 15:1-21).

(5) *God passing by in theophanies.* Several texts deriving from different traditions can nonetheless be viewed together insofar as they all speak of Yahweh passing by in a theophany (Gen. 18:3,5; Ex. 33:19; 34:6; 1 K. 19:11; Ezk. 16:6,8; Hos. 10:11). They all use the same formulaic expression: DN *ʿāḇar* PN. Gen. 18:1-16 is perhaps the point of departure for this understanding of theophany, and may have been based on an ancient sanctuary legend that told of a theophany of the divine trio in the festival cult of Hebron.[50] When Abraham's clan settled in the area in the 13th century B.C., they assimilated this local tradition into their own clan traditions and applied it to their ancestor Abraham. When the tradition was applied to Yahweh in connection with the composition of the patriarchal stories,[51] the promise of the son was added. In the process Yahweh's passing by Abraham becomes a blessed and promising encounter between Yahweh and Abraham within the framework of a theophany event.

A piece difficult to classify and internally disparate, Ex. 33:18-23 addresses Yahweh's cultic presence as disclosed in the calling of his name, and then the promise of his limitless but utterly inaccessible mercy. The paronomasia in the relative clause emphasizes both aspects: "I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy." The unique theophany portrayal in 1 K. 19:11f. resembles this text in many ways and may even have been influenced by it.[52] Although the text mentions the traditional theophany motifs of storm, earthquake, and fire as phenomena accompanying Yahweh's coming, it also assumes a plainly polemical tone in asserting that Yahweh is not really present in them; rather, a "voice of hovering silence" (M. Buber) announces his coming. This particular theophany portrayal is without analogy and may derive from a certain circle of tradition that spoke of Yahweh's cultic theophany as a coming in a kind of "dead calm." This portrayal vehemently rejects the Baʿal-Hadad theophany that has been transformed into the Yahweh praise of the Jerusalem cult (cf. Ps. 29).[53] For this circle, which also includes Elijah, Yahweh's cultic theophany is indeed without analogy, incomparable, and ineffable. Yahweh's passing by Moses and the proclamation of his compassionate actions serve in Ex. 34:6-

---

49. H. J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel* (Eng. trans., Richmond, 1966), 152-59; H. Wildberger, *Jahwes Eigentumsvolk. ATANT* 37 (1960), 59-62; but cf. esp. E. Otto, *Das Mazzotfest in Gilgal. BZAW* 107 (1975), passim; for Qumran see IV below.

50. Concerning the character of Gen. 18, cf. E. Haag, "Abraham and Lot in Gen 18–19," *De la Tôrah au Messie. FS H. Cazelles. AOAT* 212 (1981), 173-99; F. L. Hossfeld, "Einheit und Einzigkeit Gottes im frühen Jahwismus," *Im Gespräch mit dem dreieinigen Gott. FS W. Breuning* (Düsseldorf, 1985), 57-74, esp. 63ff.

51. Cf. E. Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte. WMANT* 57 (1984), 271ff.

52. J. Jeremias, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung. WMANT* 10 (^{2}1977), 112.

53. C. Macholz, "Psalm 29 und 1 Kön 19," *Werden und Wirken des AT. FS C. Westermann* (Göttingen, 1980), 325-33.

7 as a compositional hinge between the theophany in Ex. 19 and the mediation of the covenant in 34:10ff.[54] This theophanic element recedes into the background in Hos. 10:11 and Ezk. 16:6,8. Yahweh's passing by serves Hosea as a cipher for the election of Ephraim, and Ezekiel as a cipher for Yahweh's compassionate and vivifying concern for Israel.

(6) *Human guilt in transgressing against God's commandments.* Various word combinations with *ʿāḇar* refer to human culpability before God. These include *ʿāḇar bᵉrîṯ,* "transgress the covenant" (Dt. 17:2; Josh. 7:11,15; 23:16; Jgs. 2:20; 2 K. 18:12; Jer. 34:18; Hos. 6:7 par. *bāgaḏ,* "deal faithlessly"; 8:1 par. *pāšaʿ ʿal,* "transgress against"). The expression itself comes from Hosea's hand. In his response to the people's lament of repentance (6:1-3), composed in the 1st person style of divine discourse, the prophet accuses the people of having transgressed the covenant and acted faithlessly (v. 7). In this context (v. 8), Gilead is called a city of *pōʿᵃlâ ʾāwen,* "evildoers." Because this designation always implies foreign cults, *ʿāḇar bᵉrîṯ* refers to "going over to other gods" (cf. 8:1), and it is in this sense that the Deuteronomistic authors responsible for the remaining occurrences use the expression.[55]

Other expressions include *ʿāḇar pî YHWH,* "transgress Yahweh's command" (Nu. 14:41; 22:18; 24:13; 1 S. 15:24); *ʿāḇar miṣwâ,* "transgress the commandment" (Dt. 26:13; 2 Ch. 24:20); *ʿāḇar tôrâ,* "transgress instructions, laws" (Isa. 24:5 par. *ḥālap ḥōq* and *pārar bᵉrîṯ;* Dnl. 9:11). In the portrayal of his misery (vv. 3-11[2-10]), the petitioner in Ps. 38 associates his physical suffering with his transgressions, which in a sense have now become visible. He views his terrible condition as Yahweh's punishment of his sin, sin that has increased such that, like a river, it goes over his head (*ʿāḇar ʿᵃwōnôṯ*), weighing on him like a great burden (v. 5[4]). Of course, the worst thing that can happen to a sinful person is for God to turn away entirely and remain at a distance, "wrapping himself in a cloud" so that no prayer can reach him (*ʿāḇar tᵉpillâ;* cf. Lam. 3:44). Thus does Prov. 19:11 advise the wise to avoid sin at all costs (*ʿāḇar ʿal pešaʿ*).

(7) *God's chastising intervention.* The consequence of human transgression is God's chastising intervention, expressed with *ʿāḇar* in Ex. 12:12,23 and Am. 5:17. In the style of a lament for the dead, Am. 5:16f. describes the commencement of the day of Yahweh. Now, however, his passing through the people and his presence among his own community means that he is coming not for salvific deliverance but to deliver judgment of the sort that can be implemented only by his presence. Yahweh's salvific theophany in the cult corresponds in the contrasting motif to his theophany in chastising judgment, and it is in this sense that P and the Deuteronomistic historian understand Yahweh's passing by in Ex. 12:12,23. For the Egyptians, Yahweh's presence means the death of the firstborn; for Israel, it means being spared.

(8) *Passing by = forgiving.* The verb *ʿāḇar* is used several times in reference to compassionate sparing or for forgiveness of sins: *ʿāḇar lᵉ* (Am. 7:8; 8:20); *ʿāḇar ʿal pešaʿ,*

---

54. Cf. J. Halbe, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes, Ex 34,10-26. FRLANT* 114 (1975), 279-86.

55. Concerning Dt. 17:2, cf. P. Merendino, *Das deuteronomische Gesetz. BBB* 31 (1969), 173.

"pass over transgression" (Mic. 7:18 par. *nāśā' 'āwôn*); *he'ᵉḇîr 'āwôn,* "take away guilt" (2 S. 24:10 par. 1 Ch. 21:8; Zec. 3:4 par. *sûr* hiphil, "remove"; Job 7:21 par. *nāśā' peša',* "take away iniquity"); *he'ᵉḇîr ḥaṭṭā'ṯ,* "put away sin" (2 S. 12:13). Precisely in view of the parallel terms, one cannot concur with J. J. Stamm that *'āḇar* is "merely an imperfect and thus not widespread image for forgiveness, since it expresses only the notion of overlooking and disregarding rather than genuinely canceling out sin."[56]

(9) *Entering into the covenant.* The expression *'āḇar biḇᵉrîṯ* is unique in its meaning as "enter into the covenant" (Dt. 29:11[10]) with its attendant covenantal formula (v. 12[11]). This particular covenant refers to the covenant of Moab, which Deuteronomistic theology views as the counterpart or even the substitute for the covenant of Sinai/Horeb, which Israel broke through disobedience.[57] Here alone in the OT does the Horeb obligation stand over against the Moab obligation; i.e., "the Decalog is the document of the first, the entirety of Deuteronomy that of the second as an interpretation of the Decalog, as a development of the basic commandments."[58] One must "enter" into this (new) obligation. In this context, one can leave undecided the question to what extent Dt. 29:1-20(2-21) reflects the ritual of a covenant renewal ceremony or together with 29:21-27(22-28) represents a piece of late Deuteronomistic theology regarding Israel's sin and Yahweh's pardon.[59] The situation in Gen. 15 is similar. Does the passing of the smoking firepot and the flaming torch between the dismembered animals recall a ritual involving Yahweh's promissory oath to Abraham, or Yahweh's self-obligation, or does it reflect late Deuteronomistic covenantal theology?[60] This complex becomes more tangible in Jer. 34:13-16,18, an oracle of judgment developed into a Deuteronomistic sermon. The prophet refers to a rite of self-imprecation performed at the acceptance of a solemn obligation.[61]

3. *'ēḇer.* As a noun, *'ēḇer* refers to an extension > terrain > area; in connection with a river > shore area, with further qualification > the near or far shore; in a weakened version > side, as in "on one side or the other" (1 S. 14:4); "the opposite side" (1 S. 26:13; 31:7 MT; 1 K. 4:12; Job 1:19) > "over there" (1 S. 14:1); "on all sides" (1 K. 5:4[4:24]; Jer. 49:32); "in his own direction" (Isa. 47:15); "on both sides" (Ex. 32:15); "on the sides of the mouth of a gorge" (Jer. 48:28); "on the inside edge next to the ephod" (Ex. 28:26; 39:19); "straight ahead" (Ezk. 1:9,12; 10:22).

The majority of occurrences include *'ēḇer* together with the preps. *min, bᵉ,* and *'al/*

---

56. *Erlösen und Vergeben im AT* (Bern, 1940), 72.

57. A. Phillips, *Deuteronomy. CBC* (1973), 199.

58. H. D. Preuss, *Deuteronomium. EdF* 164 (1982), 158.

59. For the former see N. Lohfink, "Der Bundesschluss im Land Moab," *BZ* 6 (1962) 32-56, et passim; cf. G. Braulik, *Das Testament des Mose. Stuttgarter kleiner Kommentar* 4 (1976), 72. For the latter, L. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im AT. WMANT* 36 (1969), 23.

60. See, respectively, N. Lohfink, *Die Landverheissung als Eid. SBS* 28 (1967), 101ff.; E. Kutsch, *Verheissung und Gesetz. BZAW* 131 (1973), 6ff.; → עגל *'ēgel;* Blum, 271ff.

61. J. Schreiner, *Jeremia II. NEB* (1984), 202f.; cf. Kutsch, 8f.

'el, and alone exhibiting prepositional characteristics itself. It is not always clear just which side is meant, and whether the prepositional expression is to be rendered as "on this side" or "on the other side."

The expression *bᵉ'ēḇer* is usually translated "on this side" (NRSV "beyond") (Gen. 50:10,11; Dt. 3:8,20; Josh. 1:14; 9:1; 1 S. 31:7[bis]; Jer. 25:22). For Josh. 1:15; 5:1; 12:7; 22:7, the translation "on this side" is supported by the context; cf. also Dt. 4:41; Josh. 12:1; 13:8. In 2 instances the context suggests that *bᵉ'ēḇer* means "beyond" (Dt. 3:25; Josh. 7:7). In general *mā'ēḇer* means "beyond" (Dt. 30:13; Josh. 14:3; 17:5; Jgs. 7:25; 1 K. 4:12; 14:15; 2 Ch. 20:2; Job 1:19; Isa. 18:1; Zeph. 3:10). In 3 instances the context suggests that it means "on this side" (Nu. 32:19; 34:15; 1 Ch. 26:30). In Numbers and parts of Joshua, *bᵉ'ēḇer* and *mē'ēḇer* are used synonymously.

The expression *'el/'al 'ēḇer* refers to the opposite side in Ex. 25:37; 28:26; Dt. 30:13; Josh. 22:11; Ezk. 1:9,12; 10:22.

The combination *bᵉ'ēḇer hayyardēn* occurs frequently, and can, depending on the position of the speaker, refer to the area west of the Jordan (Nu. 32:19; Dt. 3:20,25; 11:30, etc.) or east of the Jordan (Gen. 50:10f.; Nu. 22:1; 32:32; Dt. 1:1,5; Josh. 1:14; 2:10, etc.). More frequently, the reference is to the area east of the Jordan, a situation possibly reflecting settlement patterns and geographical considerations.[62]

4. *'ᵃḇārâ.* In 2 S. 15:28 and 17:16 the term *'ᵃḇārâ* refers to a "transition, crossing > ford," here the "fords of the wilderness," i.e., the deeply cut wadis (cf. 2 S. 19:19[18]). The occasionally suggested meaning "raft, ferry," with reference to Arab. *'brt,* cannot be demonstrated.

5. *ma'ᵃḇār.* In Gen. 32:32(31) *ma'ᵃḇār* refers to the ford (of the Jabbok), and in 1 Sam. 13:23 to a crossing in the mountains, i.e., a pass. The term has a different meaning in Isa. 30:32. This announcement of salvation, composed in an apocalyptic style, speaks of the final destruction of enemies and mentions *kol ma'ᵃḇar maṭṭēh mûsāḏâ,*[63] "every stroke of the staff of punishment that Yahweh lays upon him [Assyria]."

6. *ma'bārâ.* The expression *ma'bārâ* is one further designation for a ford (Josh. 2:7; Jgs. 3:28; 12:5f.; Isa. 51:32) or for a path leading through a gorge or across a mountain gap (1 S. 14:4; Isa. 10:29).

7. *'ᵃḇārîm.* Place-names include *'ᵃḇārîm* (Jer. 22:20), whose full designation is *har hā'ᵃḇārîm* (Nu. 27:12; Dt. 32:49) and *hārê hā'ᵃḇārîm* (Nu. 33:47f.). This name refers to the northwestern part of the Moabite plateau as Mt. Nebo.

8. *'ᵃḇar nahᵃrā'.* The geographical designation for the land west of the (Euphrates) river, or Transpotamia, is *'ēḇer hannāhār* (1 K. 5:4[4:24]; Ezr. 8:36; Neh. 2:7,9; 3:7);

---

62. Lilley, 170.
63. Cf. *BHS.*

cf. *ʿaḇar nahărâ* in the Aramaic parts of the book of Ezra (4:10f.,16f.,20, etc.) and Akk. *eber nāri.*[64] Some texts still use this designation to refer to the land east of the Euphrates (Josh. 24:2f.,14f.; 2 S. 10:16 par. 2 Ch. 19:16; 1 K. 14:15; Isa. 7:20).

IV. Qumran. The Qumran texts use *ʿbr* much the same way as does the OT, though the theological aspect does come more to the forefront while the broad secular semantic spectrum is covered by corresponding synonyms. Nominal constructions of *ʿbr* are entirely absent, unless with Y. Yadin one reads *mšny ʿbry hšʿr,* "on both sides of the gate," in 11QT 37:7.

From the "secular" sphere, only the meaning "cross over" (the Jordan) is attested (1Q22 1:9; 2:2; cf. 1Q14 6:4; 4Q173 5:1). Precisely this reminiscence occupied considerable space in connection with the following thematic material.[65] The other texts address becoming a member of the community and with transgressions against the community order.

"All those who come[66] into the Community *(yḥd)* Rule shall enter *(ʿbr)* into the covenant *(bryt)* before God" (1QS 1:16). As elsewhere, *bryt* here is synonymous with community.[67] This *bryt* is frequently specified more closely as "the covenant of God" (1QS 5:8; 10:10; CD 13:14), "the new covenant" (CD 6:19; 8:21; 19:33f.), "the covenant of Abraham" (12:11), and "the covenant of repentance" (19:16). In the liturgy of the entrance ritual, priests and Levites first proclaim God's mighty deeds or Israel's transgressions. The novices entering into the covenant *(hʿbrym bbryt)* respond with "amen" (1QS 1:18,20). Then they make a confession of sin (1:24), which is followed by forgiveness and the proclamation of blessing and curse by priests or Levites, all of which is confirmed by the "amen" of the *hʿbrym bbryt* (2:10). But whoever "refuses to enter *(bwʾ)* the covenant of God shall not enter the community of his truth *(lʾ yʿbr yḥd ʾmttw)*" (2:25f.).[68] After a ten-year period of instruction in the orders of the covenant, and if he has reached his twentieth year and made the appropriate progress, the novice can enter into the circle of the enrollees *(ʿbr hpqwdym)* (1QSa 1:8f.; CD 10:1f.; 15:6; cf. Ex. 30:13f.; 38:26).[69] Each community member occupies his appointed place in the holy council. The community comes together *(ʿbr)* commensurate with this order and ranking (cf. 1QS 2:19-21). One frequent synonym of *ʿbr bbryt* is *bwʾ bbryt* (1QS 2:12,18,25f.; 5:20; 6:14f. [hiphil]; CD 2:2; 3:10; 6:11 [hophal]; 8:1; 9:2f.; 19:13f.; 1QH 5:23; 18:28 [hiphil]); see also *ḥšb bbryt* (1QS 5:11,18). In connection with violations of the covenantal order, *ʿbr* means "transgress," either absolutely (CD 15:3f.),

64. See II.4 above.

65. Cf. W. H. Brownlee, "The Ceremony of Crossing the Jordan in the Annual Covenanting at Qumran," *Von Kanaan bis Kerala. FS J. P. M. van der Ploeg. AOAT* 211 (1982), 295-302.

66. → בוא *bôʾ* (II, 20-49).

67. → יחד *yāḥaḏ* (VI, 40-48). See H.-J. Fabry, *Die Wurzel šûb in der Qumran-Literatur. BBB* 46 (1975), 25f., 290f.; → VI, 47f.

68. On this covenant initiation and renewal ritual see M. Delcor, "Le vocabulaire juridique, cultuel et mystique de l''initiation' dans le sect du Qumran," *Qumrān-Probleme*, ed. H. Bardtke (Berlin, 1963), 109-34.

69. See above, III.2.d.(2).

against God's word (1QS 5:14; CD 10:3; 1QH 12:24), or against the covenant (CD 16:12; 1Q22 1:8, emended text; 11QT 55:17).

V. LXX. As a rule the LXX renders *'br* in the general meaning "cross over, pass through," as *diabaínein* and *parérchesthai.* In addition, it often uses *diérchesthai* in passages where the precise meaning of *'br* was no longer familiar in the source document (e.g., Ps. 42:5[4]; 48:5[4]; 73:7; 88:17[16]; 103:10). Otherwise it tries to translate precisely and with attention to different meanings. For the various nuances of "go/pass through," it uses *diaporeúesthai* (Ps. 8:8[7]), *diodeúein* (Gen. 12:6); for "pass by" *parágein* (Ps. 128:8; 143:4), *paraporeúesthai* (Gen. 18:5; Ex. 12:12), *parérchesthai* (Gen. 18:3; Ps. 36:36[35]; 56:2[1]); for "pass by" in the sense of "pass away," *parágein* (Ps. 143:4) and *parérchesthai* (Gen. 50:4; 2 S. 11:27; 1 K. 18:29; Ps. 140:10[9]). The theological aspect of incurring guilt by transgressing or violating divine commandments and ordinances is expressed with *parabaínein,* variously referring to *tó rhḗma kyríou* (Nu. 14:41; 22:18; 24:13), *tón lógon kyríou* (1 S. 15:24), *tḗn diathḗkēn* (Josh. 7:11; 23:16; Jgs. 2:20; 2 K. 18:12; Hos. 6:7; 8:1), and *parérchesthai,* variously referring to *tḗn diathḗkēn* (Dt. 17:12), *tón nómon* (Isa. 24:5). The LXX renders *'br* in the meaning "pass over, disregard = forgive," with *hyperbaínein,* e.g., *tís theós hṓsper sý? exaírōn adikías kaí hyperbaínōn asebeías* (Mic. 7:18; cf. Job 9:11); cf. Symmachus, *kaí agláïsma autoú hyperbaínōn adíkēma* (Prov. 19:11 for MT *tp'rtw 'br*). God's passing by in the context of theophany is expressed by *parérchesthai,* and in this sense one might understand the passing by of Jesus the Nazorean in Lk. 18:37 as an epiphanic sign of his emerging messianic power and majesty.

Fuhs

עֶבְרָה *'eḇrâ;* עָבַר II *'āḇar* II

Contents: I. 1. Etymology, Occurrences; 2. Meaning; 3. LXX; 4. Qumran. II. Human Arrogance. III. Human Anger: 1. Causes; 2. Expressions; 3. Assessment. IV. Divine Anger: 1. Causes; 2. Expressions; 3. Assessment.

'eḇrâ. J. Barth, *Etymologische Studien zum semitischen insbesondere zum hebräischen Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1893); R. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik der Inschriften des 10.-8. Jh.s v. Ch. AKM* 38/3 (1969; ²1978); G. R. Driver, "Some Hebrew Roots and Their Meanings," *JTS* 23 (1922) 69-73; idem, "Problems in the Hebrew Text of Proverbs," *Bibl* 32 (1951) 173-97; J. A. Emerton, "Notes on Jeremiah 12:9 and on Some Suggestions of J. D. Michaelis about the Hebrew Words *naḥā, 'ebrā* and *jadă',*" *ZAW* 81 (1969) 182-91; J. A. Fichtner and O. Grether, "ὀργή," *TDNT,* V, 392-412; J. Gray, "The Wrath of God in Canaanite and Hebrew Literature," *JMEOS* 25 (1947/53) 9-19; H. Ringgren, "Einige Schilderungen des göttlichen Zorns," *Tradition und Situation: Studien zur AT Prophetie. FS A. Weiser* (Göttingen, 1963), 107-13; G. Sauer, "עֶבְרָה *'ebrā* wrath," *TLOT,* II, 835f.; R. V. G. Tasker, *The Biblical Doctrine of the Wrath of God* (London, 1951); → אנף *'ānap ('ānaph),* I, 348-60.

I. 1. *Etymology, Occurrences.* The noun *ʿeḇrâ* derives from the verbal root *ʿāḇar.* This root could be *ʿāḇar* I, "go hither," "go over," "cross over," since in several instances *ʿeḇrâ* has the meaning "arrogance" (Prov. 21:24; 22:8; Isa. 16:6; Jer. 48:30), and the hithpael of *ʿāḇar* is also attested with the meaning "be arrogant" (Prov. 20:2; 24:21 conj.). In all likelihood, however, its basis is an independent root *ʿāḇar* II, "be angry."[1] This root also occurs in Arabic as *ǵabira,* "be malicious," *ǵibr,* "malice," and *iǵbirār,* "rancor, resentment."[2] Following Sauer,[3] however, I do not think *ǵarb,* "passion, vehemence," and *ǵariba,* "disapprove," are associated with this root via an exchange of the second and third radicals. It cannot be unequivocally demonstrated whether this root also occurs in Old Aramaic as *yʿbrnh* and in Jewish Aramaic as *taʿᵃḇûrāʾ,* "wrath."[4]

2. *Meaning.* The subst. *ʿeḇrâ* occurs 34 times in the OT (with the exception of Gen. 49:7, only in the Prophets, wisdom literature, Psalms, and Lamentations), including 3 times in the plural (Ps. 7:7[Eng. v. 6]; Job 21:30; 40:11). In 30 instances it means "anger, wrath," or "expression of anger" (the latter esp. in the pl.), and in 4 instances "arrogance." The relationship between these two meanings also obtains with regard to the verb *ʿāḇar* II, which occurs 8 times in the OT (only in the hithpael, and with the exception of Dt. 3:26 only in wisdom literature and the Psalms), and yet is securely attested only 6 times (Prov. 14:16 and 26:17 probably derive from a form of *ʿrb*),[5] to which one may add one passage in which *ʿāḇar* II is conjectured (Prov. 24:21, read *tiṯʿabbār*). In 5 instances it means "be angered," and twice it means "be arrogant." Hence both meanings, each of which is attested for both the verb and the noun, are probably substantively related insofar as both describe actions deriving from unbridled emotions in which someone is driven to words or deeds with unforeseeable consequences.[6] Within the wider OT word field "anger, wrath," as covered by several other terms as well *(ʾap, ḥēmâ, ḥārôn, zaʿam, zaʿap, qeṣep, kaʿas), ʿeḇrâ* probably evokes specifically the element of unbridled emotion within anger as manifested in corresponding actions.

3. *LXX.* In cases where the meaning "anger, wrath" is intended, the LXX translates the substantive with *orgḗ* or *thymós,* or with both terms in a genitive construction (as in Isa. 9:18[19]; 13:13); in passages where the verb means "be angry," the LXX uses the terms *anabállō* and *hyperoráō.* By contrast, wherever the meaning "be arrogant" or "arrogance" is assumed, the LXX is unsure; whereas it translates the verb with *paroxýnō* (Prov. 20:2) or *apeithéō* (Prov. 24:21 conj.), it either does not translate the

---

1. *HAL,* II, 782; Driver, "Some Hebrew Roots," 69; Sauer, 835.
2. Cf. Emerton, 189.
3. P. 835.
4. For Old Aramaic see Sefire stela III, *KAI,* 224:17; cf. *DNSI,* II, 821; as well as Degen, 68. For Jewish Aramaic, see Jastrow, 1683b.
5. Cf. B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos.* HAT I/16 (^{2}1963), 67, 95.
6. See in this regard H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1997), 146.

substantive at all (Isa. 16:6), misunderstands it (Prov. 21:24), or replaces it with a different noun entirely (Prov. 22:8).

4. *Qumran.* Although the Qumran writings do indeed attest the use of *'eḇrâ* as a designation for "anger, wrath," they limit it to divine wrath (1QM 4:1; 14:1; 1QS 4:12; CD 8:3; 19:16).

II. Human Arrogance. Use of the subst. *'eḇrâ* and of the verb *'āḇar* II in the meaning "arrogance" or "be arrogant" is limited to Prov. 20:2; 21:24; 22:8; 24:21 conj.; Isa. 16:6; and Jer. 48:30. Because all these passages are exilic or postexilic texts, Jer. 48:30 being additionally dependent on Isa. 16:6,[7] and because the occurrences in Proverbs are concentrated in two subcollections, this meaning may well have developed first only during the exilic period within a limited circle, one probably influenced by the wisdom tradition.

Because *'eḇrâ* and *'āḇar* always refer to human arrogance, *'eḇrâ* is often used with *ga'ᵃwâ, gā'ôn, gē'eh* (Isa. 16:6; Jer. 48:29f.), and with *zēḏ, zāḏôn,* and *yāhîr* (Prov. 21:24). Those who act with arrogance are called "scoffers" (Prov. 21:24) because in their presumption they boastfully disregard the guidance offered by wisdom. Indeed, because arrogance represents an unjust attitude, it cannot endure; according to the law of recompense, however, injustice always provokes calamity (22:8). Concretely, this means that whoever is arrogant toward the king is running the risk of losing life itself (20:2), whence the advice that one never act with arrogance toward the king, and certainly not toward Yahweh (24:21 conj.: *šᵉnêhem*).

This relationship between arrogance and calamity also applies to that between nations. Soon after the 8th-century prophets announced judgment on both Israel and Judah for their arrogance (Hos. 5:5; Am. 6:8), the general notion arose that it was precisely also the foreign nations who would perish for their arrogance and false gossip, all of which was directed ultimately at Israel and its God (Isa. 16:6; Jer. 48:30f.).

III. Human Anger. The OT uses *'eḇrâ* in 7 instances to refer to human anger or to expressions of such anger (Gen. 49:7; Job 40:11; Ps. 7:7[6]; Prov. 11:23; 14:35; Isa. 14:6; Am. 1:11, with exilic-postexilic texts predominating in this list). At the same time, the frequent combination with the parallel term → **אנף** *'ap* either in *parallelismus membrorum* (Gen. 49:7; Ps. 7:7[6]; Isa. 14:6; Am. 1:11) or in construct (Job 40:11) is noteworthy.

1. *Causes.* Human *'eḇrâ* is ascribed both to individuals (Gen. 49:7, Simeon and Levi; Job 40:11, Job; Prov. 14:35, the king) and to groups or nations (Ps. 7:7[6], enemies; Prov. 11:23, the wicked; Am. 1:11, Edom). It can also apply figuratively to an object guided by a human hand (Isa. 14:6). It is always directed against another human being (Prov. 14:35) or another human group (Gen. 49:7; Job 40:11; Ps. 7:7[6]; Isa.

7. Cf. ibid., 119.

14:6; Am. 1:11). Accordingly, the reasons for such *'ebrâ* are the feeling of having been betrayed (Prov. 14:35), the perception that another nation's behavior is unjust (Am. 1:11), the sense of being wounded by the prosperity of the wicked (Job 40:11), or that the tyrant of a high power does not feel appropriate respect for smaller nations (Isa. 14:6).

2. *Expressions.* The form of expression is closely linked to the particular factors prompting the *'ebrâ* in the first place. In this connection, the notion is unequivocally clear that expressions of anger "pour out" (Job 40:11). The nature of wrath, however, is cruelty (Gen. 49:7); indeed, such anger can even kill (Prov. 14:35, read *tahᵃrōg* or *tehᵉgeh*). It is worth noting that *'ebrâ* is never attributed to a woman or directed specifically against women. Nor is it ever ascribed to servants or subjects.

3. *Assessment.* Although human *'ebrâ* is basically and overwhelmingly viewed as something negative, the specifics of individual cases do permit positive assessments as well. The characterization of wrath as cruel (Gen. 49:7) is unequivocally negative, and is even heightened by the application of a curse to such anger (Gen. 49:7). Ps. 7:7(6) is similarly based on a negative view of *'ebrâ* when it entreats Yahweh to intervene against the wrath of one's enemies. So also Prov. 11:23 associates wrath with the wicked and juxtaposes them with the righteous and the good. By contrast, the king's wrath at the shameless servant seems justified (Prov. 14:35), and Job's expressions of anger toward the wicked who always seem to be in good fortune, expressions to which Yahweh himself incites Job (Job 40:11), are certainly understandable.

In any event, both the negative and positive assessments of anger hold that it always leads to punishment and ruin. Hence in Gen. 49:7 Simeon and Levi are to be scattered throughout Israel because of their anger; and according to Am. 1:11, Yahweh will chastise Edom with fire because its anger against Israel did not cease. Isa. 14:4b-8 announces an analogous act of judgment on Yahweh's part against a world power as Yahweh's own reaction to behavior prompted by anger;[8] Ps. 7:7(6) entreats Yahweh to undertake similar action against unnamed adversaries. By contrast, the king's justified anger in Prov. 14:35 results in the ruin of the shameless servant, just as Job's own understandable expressions of anger in Job 40:11 are directed at the destruction of the wicked.

IV. Divine Anger. In the majority of instances, the OT uses *'ebrâ* or *'ābar* II to refer to divine wrath. The subst. *'ebrâ* occurs 23 times with this meaning; the verb *'ābar* II, meaning "be angry" exclusively with reference to divine anger, occurs 5 times. These two terms occur most frequently in the prophetic books (15 times) and in Psalms and Lamentations (10 times), and exhibit an inclination to be combined with other nouns referring to anger. Apart from combinations with *'ap* (Ps. 78:21; Hos. 13:11; Hab. 3:8)

---

8. Cf. ibid., 49.

and *ḥ^a^rôn 'ap̱* (Ps. 78:49; 85:4; Isa. 13:9,13), they are also used with *za'am* (Ps. 78:49; Ezk. 21:36[31]; 22:31). The combination *yôm 'eḇrâ ('^a^ḇārôṯ)* developed into an independent theological concept (Job 21:30; Prov. 11:4; Ezk. 7:19; Zeph. 1:15,18; in substance also Isa. 13:9,13). Ezekiel's inclination to use the expression *'ēš 'eḇrāṯî* is noteworthy (Ezk. 21:36[35]; 22:21,31; 38:19).

1. *Causes.* To the extent a cause is indicated at all, the emergence and expression of Yahweh's *'eḇrâ* are always understood as Yahweh's reaction to inappropriate human behavior. During the preexilic period, his wrath is occasioned largely by the false behavior of his own people (Isa. 9:18[19]; 10:6; Ezk. 22:21) or their leaders (Hos. 5:10; 13:11) and is thus directed against them. During the exilic-postexilic period, the circle of those who provoke and suffer this divine anger is expanded to include foreign nations (Isa. 13:9,13; Ezk. 21:36[31]; 38:19) as well as individual sinners (Job 21:30; Lam. 3:1) or the sinner in general (Ps. 90:9,11; Prov. 11:4).

Various situations provoke divine anger. One primary cause is disobedience to Yahweh and to his revealed will (Dt. 3:26; Ps. 78:21,49; Isa. 9:18[19]; Ezk. 22:21), including specifically the concrete transgressions of idolatry or worship at the high places (Ps. 78:59; Jer. 7:29) or social injustice (Ezk. 22:31; Hos. 5:10). The arrogance of foreign nations, however (Isa. 13:9,13; Ezk. 21:36[31]; 38:19), or sinful behavior in general (Ps. 90:9,11) can also elicit Yahweh's wrath.

2. *Expressions.* With regard to the form in which the divine *'eḇrâ* expresses itself, the notion of being kindled or flaring up (Ps. 78:21; Hab. 3:8) or of incinerating (Isa. 9:18[19]), and closely related also that of burning like fire (Ezk. 21:36 [31]; 22:21,31; 38:19; in substance also Isa. 9:18[19]; Zeph. 1:18) predominates, though one also encounters the image of it being poured out like water (Hos. 5:10) and of being struck like a rod (Lam. 3:1; in substance also Isa. 10:6). This threefold imagery is amplified by descriptions of the effects of this *'eḇrâ*. Yahweh's wrath limits human life and causes it to pass away suddenly (Ps. 90:9); it leads the individual (Dt. 3:26; Ps. 89:39[38]; Lam. 3:1; Ezk. 22:31; Hos. 5:10), nations (Ps. 78:21,59,62; Isa. 9:18[17]; Jer. 7:29; Ezk. 21:36[31]), and even the entire earth (Isa. 13:9; Zeph. 1:18) to calamity or destruction. It makes heaven and earth tremble (Isa. 13:13; Ezk. 38:19). The divine wrath is so powerful and mighty (Ps. 90:11) that neither wealth nor silver nor gold is able to counter it (Prov. 11:4; Ezk. 7:19; Zeph. 1:18).

Portrayals of Yahweh's *'eḇrâ* culminate in the description of the *yôm 'eḇrâ*. As an alternating expression to the *yôm 'ap̱* and especially with the *yôm YHWH,* this expression describes the day of Yahweh as Yahweh's day of judgment, understood in part eschatologically (Job 21:30; Prov. 11:4; Ezk. 7:19; Zeph. 1:15,18) and in part noneschatologically (Isa. 13:9,13).[9] It can refer to a foreign nation (Isa. 13:9,13), in which case it is understood noneschatologically and as implying salvation for Israel, or it can refer to both Israel and the whole world (Ezk. 7:19; Zeph. 1:15).

---

9. → יום *yôm* (VI, 7-32).

3. *Assessment.* In contrast to human wrath, Yahweh's wrath is always viewed positively, not least because it is always a reaction to false human behavior that runs counter to Yahweh's revealed will; as such, it is commensurate with Yahweh's holiness, majesty, and power. Hence it is to be expected, and is a sign of Yahweh's righteousness, that his *ʿeḇrâ* is directed against the individual sinner (Ps. 90:9) as well as against sinful leaders and influential classes among the people (Ezk. 22:31; Hos. 5:10), and indeed against the entire people in their sin (Ps. 78:21,59,62; Isa. 9:18[19]; 10:6; Jer. 7:29; Ezk. 22:21). It is similarly justified that the divine wrath is directed against Israel's enemies, who are, of course, thus also enemies of Yahweh's people (Ps. 78:49; Isa. 13:9,13; Ezk. 21:36[31]; 38:19).

Nor is this fundamental affirmation of Yahweh's wrath limited by this wrath's apparent failure to overtake the wicked in every instance such that one might speak of a preservation of the sinner before Yahweh's wrath (Job 21:30). Those instances in which Yahweh's wrath is genuinely averted, however, are always dependent on Yahweh's own compassion and forgiveness, since his wrath always implies chastisement prompted by human sin (Ps. 85:3[2]). Such retraction of Yahweh's wrath is similarly viewed in a positive light (Ps. 85:4[3]).

Schunck

עִבְרִי *ʿiḇrî*

Contents: I. General Considerations. II. Etymology. III. Akk. SA.GAZ/*ḫapiru:* 1. Sumer; 2. Alishar; 3. Mari; 4. Alalakh; 5. Nuzi; 6. El Amarna; 7. Boghazköy. IV. Ugar. *ʿpr(m).* V. Egyp. *ʿpr(.w).* VI. Summary. VII. OT *ʿiḇrî.* VIII. Conclusions. IX. LXX.

ʿiḇrî. W. F. Albright, *Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan* (London, 1968); A. Alt, "Bemerkungen zu den Verwaltungs- und Rechtsurkunden von Ugarit und Alalaḫ. 5. Die *ḫabiru* = SA.GAZ in Alalaḫ und Ugarit," *WO* 2 (1954/59) 237-43; idem and S. Moscati, "Hebräer," *RGG,* III (³1959), 105f.; M. Anbar, "*ʾereṣ hāʿiḇrîm* 'le pays des Hébreux,'" *Or* 41 (1972) 383-86; M. Astour, "Les étrangers à Ugarit et le statut juridique des Ḫabiru," *RA* 53 (1959) 70-76; idem, "Habiru," *IDBSup,* 382-85; F. Böhl, *Kanaanäer und Hebräer. BWAT* 9 (1911); R. Borger, "Das Problem der ʿapīru ('Ḫabiru')," *ZDPV* 74 (1958) 121-32; J. Bottéro, *Le problème des Ḫabiru à la 4e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale. Cahiers de la Société Asiatique* 12 (Paris, 1954); idem, "Ḫabiru," *RLA,* IV (1972/75) 14-27; idem, "Entre nomades et sédentaires: les Ḫabiru," *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 6 (1980) 201-13; idem, "Les Ḫabiru, les nomades et les sédentaires," *Seminar: Nomads and Sedentary People,* ed. J. S. Castillo (Mexico City, 1981), 89-107; G. Buccellati, "*ʿApirū* and *Munnabtūtu:* The Stateless of the First Cosmopolitan Age," *JNES* 36 (1977) 145-47; E. Cassin, "Nouveaux documents sur les Ḫabiru," *JA* 246 (1958) 225-36; H. Cazelles, "Hébreux, ubru et ḫapiru," *Syr* 35 (1958) 198-217; idem, "The Hebrews," *Peoples of OT Times,* ed. D. J. Wiseman (Oxford, 1973), 1-28; E. Chiera, "*Ḫabiru* and Hebrews," *AJSL* 49 (1932/33) 115-24; E. P. Dhorme, "Les Ḫabiru et les Hébreux," *JPOS* 4 (1924) 162-68; idem, "La question des Ḫabiri," *RHR* 118 (1938) 170-87; idem, "Les Habirou et les Hébreux," *RH* 78/2 (1954) 256-64; S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books*

I. General Considerations. In the OT the term *ʿiḇrî,* "Hebrews," is a name used to refer to a people descended from Eber *(ʿēḇer)* and to distinguish the proto-Israelites so named from other Semites in Syria-Palestine. The expression defines an ethnic group with no negative connotations. In a general sense the term was used by foreigners with reference to proto-Israelites, or by the latter themselves as a self-designation over against foreigners. After the founding of the Israelite state, the term *ʿiḇrî* fell into disuse except in archaic passages. We thus discern a terminological development in the description of the ancestors, the people, and the descendants of the old Israel from *ʿiḇrî* (as an ethnic designation) to *yiśrāʾēl* (and ethno-socio-political designation during the

---

of Samuel (Oxford, ²1913); R. Follet, "Ḫabiru," *Enciclopedia cattolica,* VI (1951), 1324f.; idem, "Un défi de l'histoire: Les Ḫabiru," *Bibl* 36 (1955) 510-13; R. Giveon, "Hapiru," *LexÄg,* II (1977), 952-55; A. Goetze, "The City Khalbi and the Khapiru People," *BASOR* 79 (1940) 32-34; N. K. Gottwald, *The Tribes of Yahweh* (New York, 1979); M. P. Gray, "The Ḫabirū-Hebrew Problem in the Light of the Source Material Available at Present," *HUCA* 29 (1958) 135-202; M. Greenberg, *The Ḫab/piru. AOS* 39 (1955); idem, "Ḫab/piru and Hebrews," *The World History of the Jewish People,* II (Jerusalem, 1970), 188-200, 279-81; idem, "Ḫabiru (Ḫapiru)," *EncJud,* VII (1971), 1033f.; A. Guillaume, "The Ḫabiru, the Hebrews and the Arabs," *PEQ* 78/79 (1946/47) 64-85; A. Gustavs, "Der Gott Ḫabiru," *ZAW* 40 (1922) 313f.; idem, "Was heisst *ilâni Ḫabiri*?" *ZAW* 44 (1926) 25-38; idem, "Der Gott Ḫabiru in Kerkuk," *ZAW* 58 (1940/41) 158f.; J. Halévy, "Les Habiri et les inscriptions de Taʿannek," *RevSém* 12 (1904) 246ff.; F. H. Hallock, "The Ḫabiru and the SA.GAZ in the Tell El-Amarna Tablets," in S. A. B. Mercer, *The Tell el-Amarna Tablets II* (Toronto, 1939), 838-45; J. Haspecker, "Hebräer," *LThK,* V/2 (1960), 44f.; J. W. Jack, "New Light on the Habiru-Hebrew Question," *PEQ* 72 (1940) 95-115; A. Jepsen, "Die 'Hebräer' und ihr Recht," *AfO* 15 (1945/51) 55-68; A. Jirku, "^{ilu}Ḫa-bi-ru = der Stammesgott der Ḫabiru-Hebräer?" *OLZ* 24 (1921) 246-67; idem, "Götter Ḫabiru oder Götter der Ḫabiru," *ZAW* 44 (1926) 237-42; idem, "Zur Chabiru-Frage," *ZAW* 46 (1928) 208-11; idem, "Neues über die Ḫabiru-Hebräer," *Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatische Forschung* 2 (1952/53) 213f.; M. G. Kline, "The *Ḫa-BI-ru* — Kin or Foe of Israel?" *WTJ* 19/1 (1956) 1-24; 19/2 (1957) 170-84; 20/1 (1957) 46-70; K. Koch, "Die Hebräer vom Auszug aus Ägypten bis zum Grossreich Davids," *VT* 19 (1969) 37-81; E. König, "On the Ḫabiri Question," *ExpT* 11 (1899/1900) 238-40; idem, "Zur Chabiru-Frage," *ZAW* 46 (1928) 199-208; E. G. Kraeling, "Light from Ugarit on the Khabiru," *BASOR* 77 (1940) 32; idem, "The Origin of the Name 'Hebrews,'" *AJSL* 58 (1941) 237-53; J.-R. Kupper, "Sutéens et Ḫapiru," *RA* 55 (1961) 197-200; M.-J. Lagrange, "Les Khabiri," *RB* 8 (1899) 127-32; S. Landersdorfer, "Die Boghazköi-Texte und die *Ḫabiru*-Frage," *TQ* 104 (1923) 75-83; idem, "Über Name und Ursprung der Hebräer," *TQ* 104 (1923) 201-32; B. Landsberger, "Ḫabiru and Lulaḫḫu," *Kleinasiatische Forschungen* 1 (1930) 321-34; S. H. Langdon, "The Ḫabiru and the Hebrews," *ExpT* 31 (1919/20) 324-29; N. P. Lemche, "'Hebrew' as a National Name for Israel," *ST* 33 (1979) 1-23; idem, "'Hebraeerne.' Nyt lys over habiru-hebraeerproblemet," *DTT* 43 (1980) 153-90; J. Lewy, "Ḫabiru und Hebräer," *OLZ* 30 (1927) 738-46, 825-33; idem, "Ḫābirū and Hebrews," *HUCA* 14 (1939) 587-623; idem, "A New Parallel between Ḫābirū and Hebrews," *HUCA* 15 (1940) 47-58; idem, "Origin and Signification of the Biblical Term 'Hebrew,'" *HUCA* 28 (1957) 1-13; M. Liverani, "Farsi Ḫabiru," *Vicino Oriente* 2 (1979) 65-77; O. Loretz, "Zu LÚ.MEŠ SA.GAZ.ZA *a-bu-ur-ra* in den Briefen vom Tell Kāmid el-Lōz," *UF* 6 (1974) 486; idem, *Habiru-Hebräer. BZAW* 160 (1984); G. E. Mendenhall, *The Tenth Generation* (Baltimore, 1973), esp. 122-41; W. L. Moran, "Habiru (Habiri)," *New Catholic Encyclopedia,* VI (1967), 878-80; R. T. O'Callaghan, *Aram Naharaim. AnOr* 26 (1948); D. Opitz, "Zur *Ḫabiru*-Frage," *ZA* 37 (1927) 99-103; H. Otten, "Zwei althethitische Belege zu den Ḫapiru (SA.GAZ)," *ZA* 52 (1957) 216-23; H. Parzen, "The Problem of the *Ibrim*

monarchy) to *yᵉhûḏâ* (an ethnic expression after the demise of the monarchy). The people of Eber who conquered Canaan, however, are not identical with "Israel."[1] Biblical authors use the term to refer only to the proto-Israelites. Yahweh is the God of the *'iḇrîm* (Ex. 7:15).

II. Etymology. Although the gentilic noun *'iḇrî* is associated with the PN Eber (Gen. 10:24), many derive it from the geographical term *'iḇr-* (MT: *'ēḇēr*), "the land beyond the river," itself deriving perhaps from the etymon *'br* I, "go over, pass by, cross over."[2] The apparent phonetic and cultural similarities between *'iḇrî* and other expressions in both Semitic and non-Semitic literature of the ancient Orient have prompted numerous attempts at etymological derivation.[3]

In the 2nd millennium B.C. a particular group of people occupied a position of power on the periphery of the societies of the Near East at large, and these people were known as the SA.GAZ (or SA.GAZ.ZA, SA.GA.AZ, SAG.GAZ, GAZ) in Sumerian, *ḫapiru* (less accurately: *ḫabiru*) in Akkadian, *'prm* in Ugaritic, and *'pr.w* in Egyptian. The semantic and phonetic similarities between *'iḇrî* and the descriptive terms applied to this group as well as historical parallels between the biblical *'iḇrîm* and the nonbiblical groups designated by this term have been the topic of numerous discussions. While some assumed a connection between the biblical Hebrews and these groups, others thought they were two different ethnic groups with similar characteristics. The Sumerian ideo-

---

('Hebrews') in the Bible," *AJSL* 49 (1932/33) 254-61; F. E. Peiser, "Ḫabiru," *MVÄG* 4 (1897) 16, 311ff.; A. Pohl, "Einige Gedanken zur Ḫabiru-Frage," *WZKM* 54 (1957) 157-60; G. von Rad, "Israel, Judah and Hebrews in the OT," *TDNT,* III, 356-59; G. A. Reisner, "The Ḫabiri in the El Amarna Tablets," *JBL* 16 (1897) 143-45; I. Riesener, *Der Stamm* עבד *im AT. BZAW* 149 (1978), 115-35; H. H. Rowley, "Ras Shamra and the Ḫabiru Question," *PEQ* 72 (1940) 90-94; idem, "Ḫabiru and Hebrews," *PEQ* 74/75 (1942/43) 42-53; idem, "Recent Discovery and the Patriarchal Age," *BJRL* 32 (1949/50) 44-79; M. B. Rowton, "The Topological Factor in the Ḫapiru Problem," *FS B. Landsberger. AS* 16 (1965), 375-87; idem, "Dimorphic Structure and the Problem of the *'apirû-'ibrîm,*" *JNES* 35 (1976) 13-20; T. Säve-Söderbergh, "The 'prw as Vintagers in Egypt," *Orientalia Suecana,* I (Uppsala, 1952), 5-14; A. H. Sayce, "On the Khabiri Question," *ExpT* 11 (1899/1900) 377; idem, "The Khabiri," *ExpT* 33 (1921/22) 43ff.; V. Scheil, "Notules. VII. Les Ḫabiri au temps de Rim Sin," *RA* 12 (1915) 114-16; W. Spiegelberg, "Der Name der Hebräer," *OLZ* 10 (1907) 618-20; E. Täubler, "Ḫabiru-'Ibhrim," *FS A. Marx,* 2 vols. (New York, 1950), I, 581-84; R. de Vaux, "The Hebrew Patriarchs and History," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (Eng. trans., New York, 1971), 111-21; idem, "Le problème des Ḫapiru après quinze années," *JNES* 27 (1968) 221-28; R. Weill, "Les *'pr-w* du Nouvel Empire sont des Ḫabiri des textes accadiens; ces Ḫabiri (exactement Ḫapiri) ne sont pas des 'Hébreux,'" *Revue d'égyptologie* 5 (Paris, 1946) 251f.; H. Weinheimer, "Hebräer und Israeliten," *ZAW* 29 (1909) 275-80; M. Weippert, "Abraham der Hebräer?" *Bibl* 52 (1971) 407-32; idem, *The Settlement of the Israelite Tribes in Palestine. SBT* 2/21 (Eng. trans. 1971), esp. 63-102; A. L. Williams, "Hebrew," *HDB,* I, 325-27; J. A. Wilson, "The *'Eperu* of the Egyptian Inscriptions," *AJSL* 49 (1932/33) 275-80; H. Winckler, "Die Hebräer in den Tel-Amarna-Briefen," *Studies in Memory of Rev. Dr. Alexander Kohut* (Berlin, 1897), 605-9.

1. → ישׂראל *yiśrā'ēl* (VI, 397-420).
2. Documentation in Loretz, 243.
3. Cf. Loretz, 235-48.

gram SA.GAZ might be borrowed from Akk. *šaggāšu,* "murderer, attacker,"[4] and was occasionally read as *ḫabbātu,* "robber, wandering nomad." The Hittite lists of gods and the taxation lists of Niqmaddu in Ugarit show that the general reading of SA.GAZ was Akk. *ḫap/biru.*[5] Because the local dialects attest both *ubhabiru* and *ubhapiru* (phonetically also *ḫa-BI-ri* or, defectively, *ḫa-'-BI-ru* or *ḫa-AB-BI-ri*), scholars propose two basic etymological derivations. Some read *ḫabiru* and assume a derivation either from **ḥbr,* "bind, connect," or from **'br,* "cross over, pass by," yielding *ḥbrym,* "allies," or *ḫbrym,* "wandering nomads." Those who derive *ḫabiru* from **'br* also assume a connection with West Semitic *'iḇrî* and identify the *ḫabiru* as the "Hebrews."

Ugaritic and Egyptian evidence, however, excludes this etymology. Both languages attest the medial *p* rather than *b.* Because Egyptian normally retains an original *b,* the appearance of *'pr* lends credence to the reading *ḫapiru* rather than *ḫabiru,* something supported by Ugar. *'pr.* This suggests that the medial consonant was *p* rather than *b,* and that Akk. *ḫapiru* is of West Semitic origin. The second conclusion is also based on the fact that the initial consonant *ḫ* in Akkadian suggests an originally West Semitic *'.*

The etymology thus reconstructed derives the West Semitic terms and their East Semitic relatives from **'pr,* albeit without semantic agreement, since **'pr* cannot be the West Semitic correspondent to Akk. *epēru,* "supply, provide," because the related West Semitic word is *ḥbr.*[6] It is possible that the West Semitic root goes back to *'āpār,* "dust," whence the meaning "dusty person, wanderer, itinerant."[7]

The variously suggested etymologies of *'iḇrî (*'br)* and *ḫapiru, 'pr (*'pr)* notwithstanding, G. Mendenhall, for example, insists on a common derivation, basing this on his assumption of a *b/p* shift, especially under the influence of the voiced *r.* Hence Heb. *b* may correspond to Ugar. *p* insofar as the latter became voiceless. Mendenhall finds no problem in the vowel shift from *'apir* to *'ibr* (cf. Can. *malik* > *milk,* "king").

Although no definite etymology and no definite solution to these semantic problems can be presented, philological findings regarding historical use of the word suggest that *'iḇrî* and *ḫapiru ('apiru)* are not etymologically or semantically related. The word *ḫapiru/'apiru* is a verbal adjective deriving from **'pr,* while *'iḇrî* is a gentilic noun deriving from Eber, **'br.* Ultimately, however, the possibility does exist that some relationship obtains insofar as the biblical gentilic noun is a postmonarchical development of the word that once referred to an "outlaw" or *ḫapiru* (see discussion below).

III. Akk. SA.GAZ/*ḫapiru.*

1\. *Sumer.* The SA.GAZ first appear in Sumer during the Third Dynasty of Ur (2050-1930 B.C.) and the Isin-Larsa period (1930-1697 B.C.). The sparse textual evidence mentions SA.GAZ who earn their livelihood from cattle and sheep or clothing.[8] Con-

---

4\. *AHw,* III, 1124.

5\. For Hittite see *KBo,* I, 1, 50; 2, 27 etc. For Ugarit see *KTU,* 4, 48, 1; 4, 73, 12; 4, 346, 7; 4, 380, 16; 4, 610, 27.

6\. *AHw,* 223, proposes *wpr.*

7\. *KTU,* 1, 2, IV, 2; 1, 3, III, 15; 1, 5, VI, 15; 1, 17, I, 28; II, 17.

8\. e.g., *RUL,* 51f.; *RA,* 12, 115.

text shows that the SA.GAZ were mercenaries or auxiliary troops employed by the state.

2. *Alishar.* The term *ḫapiru* appears in one text from Alishar in Asia Minor.[9] This is the earliest witness to the syllabic orthography *ḫa-pi-ru,* and attests the widespread dissemination of this particular group in the Near East during the early 2nd millennium. Their status parallels that in Sumer in being dependent on the state.

3. *Mari.* In the first half of the 2nd millennium, we find the *ḫapiru* in Mari, where they are described on the one hand as warriors of the state, and on the other as bandits.[10] The term *ḫapiru* refers apparently in part to mercenaries of the state, and in part to independent mercenaries who plunder cities.

4. *Alalakh.* In Alalakh the *ḫapiru* appear in one text from the 18th century, and then in numerous texts from the 15th century.[11] The first text is a contract whose date is noted as the year in which the "*ḫapiru* soldiers made peace." This text attests the *ḫapiru* as an independent group with enough power to force the king to sign a peace treaty. The later documents consist of lists of the *ḫapiru* forces of various cities under the sovereignty of Alalakh. One particular text constitutes an exception insofar as it describes the exile of King Idrimi and the hospitality he enjoyed among the *ḫapiru.*[12] Again, the *ḫapiru* appear as both independent and dependent at the same time. The names of the *ḫapiru* soldiers are largely local Hurrian names, and their earlier vocations are listed as thieves, slaves, mayors or city administrators, and priests. They seem to be of urban rather than of rural origin.

5. *Nuzi.* The 15th-century Nuzi Tablets describe the *ḫapiru* as people who have surrendered themselves to dependency on either individuals or the state. Whereas earlier texts attested the *ḫapiru* as autonomous groups that occasionally "sold" themselves into state service as mercenaries, the Nuzi texts attest them even as domestic slaves. Public documents attest the *ḫapiru* as dependent on the state in a fashion resembling that in Sumer.[13] One series of administrative texts from the court of Teḫiptilla shows that these *ḫapiru* could actually redeem their service contracts themselves; that is, they were not slaves in the strict sense but rather sold their labor rather than their actual persons.[14] Such an arrangement is better described as adoption, and the *ḫapiru* accordingly had more freedom than normal slaves. Furthermore, and in contrast to the situation at Alalakh, where most of the *ḫapiru* were local residents, those at Nuzi were largely foreigners. Whereas the Hurrians constituted the

9. Gelb, *Hurrians and Subarians. SAOC* 22 (1944), 5, III.
10. *ARM,* II, 131; Dhorme, "La question des Ḫabiri," 175.
11. Alalakh Tablet 58, III; *AP,* 180f.
12. Smith, pls. 9f.
13. E.g., *SMN,* 1120, 3199.
14. *JEN,* V, 453, 459, 488.

majority of the population, up to two-thirds of the *ḫapiru* were recruited from eastern Semites.

6. *El Amarna.* Arguments advocating the simultaneity of the *'iḇrî* with the *ḫapiru* are based on the political situation in Syria-Palestine prior to the Israelite conquest, particularly as described in the Amarna Tablets. These portray the SA.GAZ as hostile groups, and mention specifically ʿAbdi-Aširta of Amurru and his sons, who instigated a revolt against Rib-Addi of Byblos; the latter entreated the pharaoh to dispatch reinforcements to defeat the SA.GAZ.[15] Because the pharaoh hesitated, the SA.GAZ successfully assumed control over all the cities in Rib-Addi's region.[16] Hoping to become landowners again through the downfall of the city-state princes, the population supported the SA.GAZ.[17] The same situation obtained in all of Syria.[18]

In all these texts, the SA.GAZ represent the enemies of Egypt and its vassals, and consist of princes, city dwellers, and others who rebelled against the prosperity and power of those who had controlled the land for so long. That is, the SA.GAZ are by no means merely nomads and seminomads. Although the situation was similar in Palestine, there was one important difference. The letters of Biridiya of Megiddo, Labaya, Milkilu of Gezer, ÈR-Ḫeba of Jerusalem, and others entreat the pharaoh of Egypt to send reinforcements to put down the rebellion.[19] These texts also show, however, that a great many skirmishes took place between the various vassals, and that the SA.GAZ were often signed on by one city-state prince in order to disrupt another.[20] That is, this term refers not just to rebels but also to the mercenaries of a rival ruler.

During the 15th/14th centuries B.C. in Syria-Palestine, the *ḫapiru* were thus a heterogeneous group consisting of rebels and outcasts (from the perspective of the writer). In Syria they appear as rebels against the political system, and in Palestine also as mercenaries and occasional soldiers (subject to the local military leader who had signed them on) and as plundering terrorists. The expression SA.GAZ was a designation of status rather than an ethnic feature. Individuals or even entire communities and cities could join this group. The SA.GAZ and their leaders were often described as "dogs" *(kalbu)* or "stray dogs" *(kalbu ḫalqu)*.[21] This pejorative term refers to those standing outside the law who have run away from their masters.[22]

7. *Boghazköy.* In the Hittite texts of Boghazköy, the terms SA.GAZ and *ḫapiru* indicate a position of respect in regard to those so named. In the list of gods among the contracts of Šuppiluliuma (1375-1335 B.C.) and Ḫattusilis III (1275-1250 B.C.), they appear

---

15. EA, 71; 75.
16. EA, 79; 81; 90; 91; 104; 116.
17. EA, 74.
18. Cf. EA, 144; 148.
19. See, respectively, EA, 243; 254; 271; 286 (here *ḫaBIru* instead of SA.GAZ).
20. EA, 287; 289.
21. For the former see EA, 71; 76; 79; 85; 91. For the latter, EA, 67.
22. → כלב *keleḇ* (VII, 146-57).

as respected members of society next to the Lulaḫi.[23] One incantation against strife lists the *ḫapiru* between the nobility and normal citizens.[24] They are not slaves or members of the upper classes of society or a separate ethnic group.

IV. Ugar. ***'pr(m).*** The Ugaritic taxation lists no longer stigmatize the *ḫapiru* as "outcasts" and "rebels." The expression appears rather often in the taxation lists of Niqmaddu in the place-name *ḫlb 'prm,* "Aleppo of the 'Apiru,"[25] suggesting that this was a peaceful urban settlement. The term *'prm* also perhaps appears in a list of allocations for the city *Miḫd.*[26] One letter (to Hammurabi[?]) mentions four hundred *'prm* who played a certain role in royal politics and who perhaps participated in a revolt that led to the downfall of Ugarit.[27]

In Ugarit the expression *'prm* acquires new meaning. Although its ethnic significance is unclear, the expression that in the Amarna Tablets referred to rebels and outcasts now refers to a settled group who pay taxes to the state, are active in some sense in politics, and whose leaders *(rb 'prm)* occupy high positions within the royal administration.[28]

V. Egyp. ***'pr(.w).*** In Egyptian texts of the 16th-12th centuries B.C.,[29] the term *'pr(.w)* refers on the one hand to a particular part of the Palestinian population, and on the other to deported slaves and laborers in Egypt. Three texts are of particular significance. The Memphis Stela of Amenhotep II (second half of the 15th century) reckons the *'pr.w* among the prisoners he brought to Egypt. They are mentioned after the "princes" and "brothers of the princes" and before the Shasu Bedouin and Hurrians. It is questionable whether, possibly like the Hittite incantation text, this particular order reveals something about their status. The Beth-shean stela of Seti I describes the *'pr.w* as forces that fought against the "Asiatics." In Papyrus Harris 500, the account of the conquest of Joppa by one of the generals of Thutmose III, the pharaoh's general asks the leaders of Joppa for permission to allow the *mariyannu* warriors to keep their horses in the city lest some "*'pr* come by and steal them." These texts characterize the *'pr.w* much as the Akkadian texts do: as independent plunderers and bandits who terrorize the population, including the armies. Their activities take place around cities, and not necessarily in desert or peripheral areas.

VI. Summary. Extrabiblical literature thus does not use the terms SA.GAZ, *ḫapiru,* and *'apiru* as ethnic terms or to describe any geographical or ethnic origin. They refer rather to groups without any social or political connections. When they do appear

---

23. *KBo,* I, 1, 50; 2, 27; V, 3, I, 56; 9, IV, 12; IV, 10, 3.
24. *KUB,* IX, 34, IV.
25. *KTU,* 4.48, 1; 4.73, 12; 4.346, 7; 4.380, 16; 4.610, 26.
26. *KTU,* 4.611, 8 (uncertain reading).
27. *KTU,* 2.47, 7; Loretz, *Habiru-Hebräer,* 85.
28. *KTU,* 4.752.
29. Documentation in Giveon, 953f.; and Loretz, *Habiru-Hebräer,* 35ff.

as a subordinated group, it is only in a military sense as voluntary mercenaries. Otherwise they exhibit a certain autonomy in hiring out their labor to individuals and/or the state. Above all else, however, they seem to have been an opportunistic group. In the event of political agitation, the *ḫapiru* exploited the opportunity as mercenaries of the state or as robbers and bandits. The accounts of their activities are subjectively colored depending on whether the writer was sympathetic or unsympathetic toward them.

One can state definitively that the *ḫapiru* groups were neither farmers nor shepherds. They lived in cities rather than in rural areas, and kept domestic animals for their livelihood. They do not appear as landowners, and when, as in Ugarit, they appear as settlers, they live in cities. Hence the SA.GAZ, *ḫapiru,* and *'apiru* groups probably consisted of those who were dissatisfied with existing conditions regarding landownership. They were not interested in working land for others. They were opportunists, and thus must have viewed the independent life of mercenaries as being substantially more rewarding, both socially and financially, than the life of farmers or shepherds in peripheral areas.

Any classification into separate groups must remain purely speculative. Some of these people were refugees, vagabonds, thieves, former slaves, and prisoners of war. Others were princes, priests, former mayors, musicians, and possibly retired military personnel unable or unwilling to return to work whatever land was granted to them upon discharge.

VII. OT *'iḇrî.* The term *'iḇrî,* "Hebrews," occurs 34 times in the OT as an adjective (*'îš 'iḇrî,* Gen. 39:14) or as *nomen gentilicium.* It occurs in both J and E, but never in P. It is ordinarily used by foreigners (Egyptians or Philistines) to distinguish the descendants of Eber and Abraham as a specific ethnic group from the Canaanites, Hurrians, and other inhabitants of Syria-Palestine.

The oldest OT witness to use the term *'iḇrî* already delimits its meaning quite closely. Gen. 14:13 describes Abraham as a "Hebrew." Although the word is actually a gentilic noun deriving from the PN Eber (Gen. 10:24f.), not all the descendants of Eber (Hebrews, Arameans, and the Arabic tribes) are actually "Hebrews." The entire OT restricts the term to the Israelites themselves, the descendants of the ancestor Abraham and his son Isaac and his grandson Jacob (cf. 1 S. 13:3f. and the alternation between "Hebrews" and "Israelites" in connection with Yahweh, Ex. 5:1-3). The term *'iḇrî* is thus an early appellative for the descendants of Abraham, and is synonymous with *bᵉnê yiśrā'ēl* and *yᵉhûḏâ* of later periods.

On the basis of Gen. 14, many interpreters are inclined to assume some connection between the *'iḇrîm* and the SA.GAZ/*ḫapiru/'apiru,* if not a genuinely ethnic connection then at least a sociopolitical one. That is, the term *'iḇrî* as a designation for a certain people and family presupposes a social status similar to that of the *ḫapiru,* albeit one that at least at the time of the biblical authors had long ceased to be relevant. Abraham is a foreign immigrant in a land where he possesses no rights at all; it is a politically and militarily unsettled period in the 2nd millennium B.C. during which *ḫapiru* groups could be found everywhere in the ancient Orient.

Although this argumentation seems plausible enough, other considerations call it into question.

1. As a keeper of livestock and sheep, Abraham avoids the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah in favor of a rural existence. This directly contradicts what we know about the *ḫapiru,* who exhibited a strong preference for urban areas and avoided shepherding.

2. The *ḫapiru* groups hired themselves out as mercenaries or lived as robbers and plunderers during times of military and political upheaval. Warlike bands in the Negeb notwithstanding, Abraham remains a shepherd and becomes active in this sense only when his kinsman Lot (Gen. 14:14) is taken captive. After he has rescued Lot, his family, and the possessions stolen from the king of Sodom, he returns the goods (vv. 21-24). This is not the deed of a *ḫapiru,* whose opportunistic, selfish behavior is everywhere evident in ancient Near Eastern texts. Abraham reacts with consideration of clan, not on the basis of any service obligation toward a king.

3. Finally, Abraham is a foreigner and as such is excluded from the protection granted the "citizens" of these kingdoms. Even if this is comparable to the situation of the *ḫapiru,* the latter did also include local inhabitants, among whom some once occupied political offices. The description of the patriarchs as wandering Arameans does not necessarily connect them with the *ḫapiru.* Accordingly, in Gen. 14:13 the term *'iḇrî* is an ethnic term distinguishing Abraham and his clan from other groups (Hurrians, v. 6; Amalekites and Amorites, v. 7).

The term *'iḇrî* then occurs another 5 times in the story of Joseph (J and E). The word is used 3 times by a foreigner to describe Joseph's ethnic identity (Potiphar's wife, Gen. 39:14,17 [J]; the chief cupbearer, 41:12 [E]). Gen. 39:17 shows that the word is used more as an ethnic than as a social designation. In the expression *hā'eḇeḏ hā'iḇrî,* "the Hebrew slave," *hā'eḇeḏ* indicates Joseph's social status, while *hā'iḇrî* distinguishes him ethnically from other slaves. Its antithetical relationship to *miṣrî,* "Egyptian," in 43:22 (both times in the pl. [J]; cf. Ex. 1:19) unequivocally demonstrates the ethnic content of *'iḇrî.*

The final occurrence of *'iḇrî* in the Joseph narrative is in Gen. 40:15 (E). Joseph explains that he was abducted "from the land of the Hebrews" *(mē'ereṣ hā'iḇrîm).* Joseph views himself as someone who comes from a country belonging to the Hebrews. This militates against those who associate the patriarchs with the *ḫapiru* by arguing that both groups were nomads, refugees, and foreigners in a land belonging to others. Joseph is unequivocally identified with a geographical area identified as the land of his people. Furthermore, the only witness to the use of *ḫapiru/'apiru* as a place-name comes from Ugarit (13th century). The Ugaritic expression *ḫlb 'prm,* "Aleppo of the *'apiru,*" refers to a city rather than to an indefinite area where livestock and sheep graze. The *ḫapiru/'apiru* are in general never associated with landownership or land possession. The expression *'ereṣ hā'iḇrîm,* however, refers to the area controlled by the "Hebrews."

The term is next used in the Yahwistic biography of Moses (Ex. 1:15–2:22) as an ethnic term distinguishing the "Hebrews" from the "Egyptians" and other groups in Egypt during that period. The pharaoh orders the "Hebrew midwives" *(lamᵉyalleḏōṯ hā'iḇrîyōṯ,* Ex. 1:15) to kill any boys to whom the "Hebrew women" *(hā'iḇrîyôṯ,* vv.

16,19, as a subst.) might give birth. The midwives, however, do not obey, and their answer regarding why emphasizes the ethnic connotation of the word: "Because the Hebrew women *(hā'iḇrîyōṯ)* are not like the Egyptian women *(hannāšîm hammiṣrîyōṯ);* for they are vigorous and give birth before the midwife comes to them" (1:19). Whether true or merely an excuse, the response attests in any case the ethnic use of the term *'iḇrîyōṯ.* The midwives argue that the capacity of the Hebrew women to give birth quickly resides in their nature as "Hebrews," which is different from that of the Egyptians. This has nothing to do with social status.

The remaining occurrences of *'iḇrî* in this section essentially mirror the previous ones. Moses is introduced as one of the Hebrews' children (*mîyalḏê hā'iḇrîm,* Ex. 2:6), and Pharaoh's daughter employs a Hebrew woman (*min hā'iḇrîyōṯ,* v. 7) as a nurse. The portrayal of Moses' crime and flight from Egypt again juxtaposes *'iḇrî* and *miṣrî,* both clearly with ethnic meaning (vv. 11,13). The remaining occurrences of *'iḇrî(m)* in the chapters concerning Moses' calling and confrontation with the pharaoh use the expression *'elōhê hā'iḇrîyîm* (Ex. 3:18 [J]) or *'elōhê hā'iḇrîm* (Ex. 5:3; 7:16; 9:1,13; 10:3 [J]), "the God of the Hebrews." This is the name of God under whose authority Moses is commanded to go to Pharaoh (3:18).

At God's behest, Moses and the "elders of Israel" *(ziqnê yiśrā'ēl)* are to say to Pharaoh, "Yahweh, the God of the Hebrews *(YHWH 'elōhê hā'iḇrîyîm),* has met with us; let us now go a three days' journey into the wilderness, so that we may sacrifice to Yahweh, our God *(YHWH 'elōhênû)*" (Ex. 3:18 [J]). Yahweh *(YHWH)* and *'elōhê hā'iḇrîyîm* are synonymous names of the same deity. Similarly, the expanded expression "the God of the Hebrews" is synonymous with "the God of Israel" (cf. Ex. 5:3). Finally, in connection with the narrative, "the God of the Hebrews" is identified with "the God of your [Moses'] father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (v. 6 [E]). This corresponds to the restriction noted earlier that not all of Eber's descendants were considered "Hebrews," but rather only those of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The ethnic signification of *'iḇrî* is discernible in its antithesis to the Egyptians, whose land the Hebrews leave, and the Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites, whose land the Hebrews will inhabit (vv. 8,17). Here the term *'iḇrî* refers neither to social status nor to class but to the Hebrew people who will soon establish the nation and state of Israel.

In Ex. 5 the Yahwist attests the connection between "the God of Israel" and "the God of the Hebrews." Moses turns to Pharaoh at the behest of *YHWH 'elōhê yiśrā'ēl* (v. 1) and *'elōhê hā'iḇrîm* (v. 3). J intensifies this identification in the portrayals of the encounter between Moses and Pharaoh (7:16; 9:1,13; 10:3) through the combination "God of the Hebrews" as an apposition to Yahweh.

Hence the distinction between *'iḇrîm* and *yiśrā'ēl* begins to blur as early as the Yahwist. The former is an ethnic designation distinguishing the proto-Israelites from other groups in the Syro-Palestinian region, the latter a religio-political word for the *'iḇrîm,* who are in the process of becoming a political group constituted through the covenant at Sinai. Although these terms gradually become interchangeable, the term *'iḇrîm* continues to be the one chosen to express Israel's ethnicity.

Finally, the term *'iḇrî* also occurs in the laws concerning slaves in the Covenant Code

(Ex. 21:2; cf. Dt. 15:12; Jer. 34:8-17, esp. vv. 9,14; cf. in this regard Lev. 25).[30] When a Hebrew buys a Hebrew slave *(kî tiqneh 'eḇeḏ 'iḇrî)*, he must release him as a free man after six years (cf. Lev. 25:40). The slave is to leave just as he came (Ex. 21:1-3; Lev. 25:41). If the slave so desires, however, he may remain the slave of his master (Ex. 21:3-6).

Notwithstanding the fact that a master buys the slave *(tiqneh 'eḇeḏ)* or that a slave sells himself (*nimkar;* Lev. 25:39), this situation resembles more a contractual rendering of services. That is, a person buys the services of a Hebrew for a certain period of time. "If any who are dependent on you become so impoverished that they sell themselves to you, you shall not make them serve as slaves. They shall remain with you as hired or bound laborers. They shall serve with you until the year of the jubilee" (Lev. 25:39f.). The period of slavery is limited for a Hebrew slave even though voluntary lifelong slavery is indeed possible. The Holiness Code develops the laws regarding slaves in an increasingly more humane fashion by picking up the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic term "brother" as a qualification,[31] consistently avoiding the term *'iḇrî* (Lev. 25:43,46).

Treatment of a "Hebrew slave" is utterly different from that of a prisoner of war or of a "non-Hebrew" slave. This legally regulated situation derives from the fact that the enslavement of a Hebrew by another Hebrew has a completely different meaning than the enslavement of a person from another ethnic group. The Hebrew slave is a "brother," or "member of the community" (so NRSV; *'āḥ,* Dt. 15:12; cf. Lev. 25:35, 39), i.e., someone who participated in the common experience of slavery in Egypt. This ethnic bond and the historical inheritance provide the foundation for this legislation (Dt. 15:15; cf. Lev. 25:42,55).

Similarly eased regulations apply to the female Hebrew slave (cf. Ex. 21:7-11; Dt. 15:12). The legislation regulating the treatment of "Hebrew" servants recalls the *ḫapiru* who served in the court of Teḫiptilla in Nuzi, whose documentation suggests that the relationship between master and slave was more that of adoption than of slavery in the traditional sense. Although creditors may indeed insist that foreigners settle debts, obligations of Hebrews expire after six years (Dt. 15:1-3). A clear distinction exists between Hebrew servants on the one hand and foreigners or slaves from foreign countries on the other (cf. Lev. 25:44-46), a distinction referring directly to the Hebrew people. The main difference concerned the duration of service, which for non-Israelites was indefinite but for Israelites was limited to six years and included the possibility of redeeming oneself at any time. Furthermore, members of one's own people were treated with more sympathy than were foreigners.

The book of Jeremiah also explicitly addresses the subject of the Hebrew slave (*'eḇeḏ 'iḇrî;* Jer. 34:8-22), and in so doing is generally acknowledged as being dependent on Dt. 15:12-18.[32] Jeremiah suggests, for example, that Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jeru-

---

30. → עבד *'āḇaḏ* (III.1).

31. → אח *'āḥ ('āch)* (I, 188-93).

32. Cf. Loretz, *Habiru-Hebräer,* 161-65; however, cf. also the opposing position of H. Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches. BZAW* 132 (1973), 86-106; and I. Cardellini, *Die biblischen Sklaven-Gesetze im Lichte des keilschriftlichen Sklavenrechts. BBB* 55 (1981), 312-23. The release of the slaves is in accordance with the law of the Jubilee in Lev. 25, however.

salem is actually God's punishment on Judah for having failed to follow the laws governing the release of Hebrew slaves. All too late, the slave owners did agree to release their slaves at the height of the siege (for obviously selfish reasons). After the release of the slaves, Nebuchadnezzar withdrew his troops (to counter an Egyptian attack), after which the Jewish slave owners enslaved their former slaves anew. Jeremiah denounces this deed as hypocritical and as a betrayal of Yahweh's covenant.

Every Hebrew slave must be released at the release summons[33] and may not be enslaved again (Jer. 34:9,14) unless he freely chooses to enter lifelong servitude, as described earlier. Jer. 34:9 uses *ʿiḇrî* and *yᵉhûḏî* synonymously, thus completing the terminological development regarding the designation of Abraham's descendants from *ʿiḇrî* to *yiśrāʾēl* to *yᵉhûḏî*.

In all this, considerable similarities emerge between the economic assessment of Hebrew slaves in regard to their Hebrew masters and the *ḫapiru* who served the state or, in Nuzi, in Teḫiptilla's court. The most significant difference is that the biblical material establishes a specific connection between people of the same ethnic group.

Legislation regarding prisoners of war and "foreigners" varies. "Brothers" and "sisters" have more freedom and certainly more protection within the slave-master relationship. By contrast, slave legislation in Nuzi does not consider this ethnic element; the *ḫapiru* are first and foremost foreigners lacking any ethnic relationship with those whom they serve. The *ḫapiru* in Nuzi and the *ʿiḇrî* slaves in the Bible are similar insofar as their enslavement represented more a contractual economic matter than a complete loss of personal freedom. In the OT this agreement existed only among Hebrews and was the result of the common ethnic bond rather than of social status.

The remaining occurrences of *ʿiḇrî(m)* (excepting Jon. 1:9) are in 1 Samuel. In every instance (4:6,9; 13:3,7,19; 14:11,21; 29:3), the word is used alongside *bᵉnê yiśrāʾēl* to designate the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob living under the covenant with Yahweh, their God. All occurrences involve the wars with the Philistines, and the last is in connection with Saul's death. Significantly, from now on the biblical authors refer to Yahweh's people as the *bᵉnê yiśrāʾēl* or as *yiśrāʾēl* rather than as *ʿiḇrî(m)*, suggesting that even though these expressions were often used synonymously, *ʿiḇrî(m)* had first of all ethnic connotations, while *yiśrāʾēl* was a religio-political term that referred to the ethnic group only when that group became Yahweh's covenant people and the nation Israel.

Those who continue to advocate an identification between the *ʿiḇrîm* and the *ḫapiru/ʿapiru* assert that the Hebrews in 1 Samuel resemble the *ḫapiru* in extrabiblical texts both socially and culturally. That is, these Hebrews appear to be a peripheral group within Philistine society. All of Palestine was experiencing political unrest and ongoing struggles between Philistine and Hebrew bands. For example, David's situation with his own group of "outlaws" resembles accounts in extrabiblical texts, especially the Amarna Tablets, in which the *ḫapiru* appear as mercenaries. One must note, however, that David is never actually called a "Hebrew." Furthermore, in every instance 1 Samuel equates

---

33. → דְּרוֹר *dᵉrôr* (III, 265-69).

'iḇrîm with *yiśrā'ēl* or with *bᵉnê yiśrā'ēl.* All these expressions are used to distinguish this particular ethnic group, whose roots go back to Abraham, from the Canaanites and other indigenous ethnic groups, the Philistines, and foreigners.

Other differences between the *ḥapiru* mercenaries and the *'iḇrîm* can also be found in 1 Samuel. The *ḥapiru* wanted to remain mercenaries, a lifestyle that suited them better than agriculture or any other vocations. By contrast, David wanted to become king, and his actions reflect the establishment and development of a loyal troop. Israel's goal is to take possession of Canaan and to expel the indigenous inhabitants. By contrast, the *ḥapiru* have no designs on land acquisition or settlement. Only the Ugaritic witnesses concerning the *ḥapiru/'apiru* suggest any settled lifestyle and peaceful coexistence.

Those assuming some connection between the *ḥapiru* and the "Hebrews" adduce three passages in particular from 1 Samuel: (1) In 13:3 Saul uses the term *'iḇrîm* to address his own people. "Let the Hebrews hear *(yišmᵉ'û hā'iḇrîm)!*" In all other instances, either foreigners addressing Hebrews use the word or the Hebrews themselves use it to differentiate themselves ethnically in response to foreigners. This passage seems to contradict every rule and to attest at least one instance where the ethnic connotation is lacking. But because the entire books of Exodus and 1 Samuel use the word *'iḇrîm* synonymously with *yiśrā'ēl,* this argument (if an argument at all) is weak. Furthermore, some commentators read *pāšᵉ'û* instead of *yišmᵉ'û* (cf. LXX *ēthetēkasin*), "the Hebrews have revolted," and place the clause "Saul blew the trumpet throughout all the land" after *hā'iḇrîm.*[34] In this configuration the cry "the Hebrews have revolted" comes from the mouths of the Philistines, and the passage is commensurate with the other OT passages (cf. 1 S. 4:6; 13:19; 14:11; 29:3). The problem with this textual emendation, however, is that the LXX also reads *hoi doúloi,* "the slaves," for *Hebraíoi* (*'bdym* instead of *'brym;* cf. also 14:21 and 4:9, where *Hebraíoi* and *doúloi* appear together; the Philistines view the Hebrews as their slaves).

Whether it is Saul or the Philistines who speak of "the Hebrews," in neither instance can the word be equated with *ḥapiru.* Although the sociopolitical status of the Hebrews during this period does indeed resemble that of the *ḥapiru* in many respects, the ethnic content of *'iḇrîm* prevents any connection.

(2) The MT in 1 S. 13:7 seems to distinguish between *'îš yiśrā'ēl* and *'iḇrîm,* transcending the distinction addressed by a basically ethnic term. After Jonathan's attack on the Philistine garrison at Geba, the Philistines begin an offensive Israel is unable to withstand. The MT acknowledges this: when the *'îš yiśrā'ēl* saw "that they were in distress . . . the people *(hā'ām)* hid themselves . . . some Hebrews crossed the Jordan *(wᵉ'iḇrîm 'āḇᵉrû 'eṯ-hayyarḏēn)*" (vv. 6f.). According to some scholars, in this distinction between "the Israelites" and "the Hebrews," the *'iḇrîm* represent a group that, while indeed joining *yiśrā'ēl,* is nonetheless not really an integral part of it, but rather something like a mercenary group on the periphery of Israelite society.

Many scholars consider the passage corrupt and read *wayya'aḇrû ma'bᵉrôṯ hayyardēn* (cf. LXX: *hoi diabaínontes diébēsan tón Iordánēn*), eliminating the refer-

34. E.g., P. K. McCarter, *I Samuel. AB* 8 (1980), 225.

ence to the Hebrews and making *hā'ām* the subject. That is, the people either hide somewhere in the countryside or flee across the Jordan to escape the Philistines.

The problems with the MT can be resolved even without assuming that the text is corrupt. The three expressions *'îš yiśrā'ēl, hā'ām,* and *'iḇrîm* might all refer to the same group: the Israelites. The term *'iḇrîm* as an ethnic designation and *yiśrā'ēl* as a religio-political one might also have coalesced after a certain period, since political groups are frequently inclined to emphasize their common derivation or ancestry as an additional binding element, be it genuine or merely invented. The religio-political expression *yiśrā'ēl* thus gradually incorporated the ethnic component, describing thereby the political state more precisely, a process beginning in Exodus and culminating in 1 Samuel. The term *'iḇrîm* finally loses its independent status altogether when the later term itself includes the ethnic aspect of the older one. The term *yiśrā'ēl* thus becomes the biblical authors' designation for the political state even though their affinity and connection with the older term remains in that, despite everything, Yahweh is still the God of Abraham.

(3) 1 S. 14:21 reads: "Now the Hebrews [MT: *hā'iḇrîm;* LXX: *hoi doúloi;* cf. 13:3] who previously had been with the Philistines and had gone up with them into the camp turned [from them] and joined the Israelites who were with Saul and Jonathan." On the surface this verse seems to present a problem similar to that in 13:7: "the Hebrews" and Israel represent two different groups. The Hebrews are either non-Israelites who join Saul and his son, are a group similar to the *ḫapiru/'apiru,* or are both.

A mediating interpretation, however, views *hā'iḇrîm* and *yiśrā'ēl* as interchangeable and as representatives of the same religio-political group. The Israelites were not united in their political reaction to Philistine rule. Some resisted militarily, others remained neutral, and still others (like David) played both sides. Those Israelites (here: Hebrews) who until now had preferred to accept Philistine rule now changed over and joined Saul. These are none other than those Israelites who emerged from their hiding places when the Philistine threat had passed (v. 22). The Hebrews in v. 21 are then the Israelites who are loyal to Saul if it is to their advantage. Even though their actions seem comparable to those of the *'prm* in extrabiblical witnesses, the ethnic element of *hā'iḇrîm* is retained.

Biblical use of *'iḇrî(m)* as a designation for Yahweh's people ceases after 1 S. 29:3. Because the political terms become much more important than the ethnic term during the monarchy, the term *yiśrā'ēl* and later the political states *yiśrā'ēl* and *y^ehûḏâ* replace *'iḇrî(m).* According to Jon. 1:9, Jonah identifies himself over against the inhabitants of Nineveh as "a Hebrew." We have already seen in Exodus that the Israelites identify themselves as Hebrews over against foreigners. This late use of *'iḇrî* can only be explained as an archaism.

VIII. Conclusions. Biblical evidence supports the view that *'iḇrî* and its variations are ethnic terms referring to the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. After these descendants established a political state (based on the Sinai covenant), the ethnic term *'iḇrî* was used along with the religio-political term *yiśrā'ēl,* the term *'iḇrî* itself primarily in contexts where Israelites wanted to distinguish themselves ethnically from non-Israelites. The slave laws demonstrate the significance of the different treatment accorded Israelites and others.

After the founding of the state, the ethnic aspect of the term *'iḇrî* became less significant and was incorporated into the term *yiśrā'ēl* (or abandoned altogether). After this point, biblical authors no longer used the term *'iḇrî*.

The philological problems attaching to the alleged connections between *ḫapiru/ 'apiru* and *'iḇrî* are joined by ethnic and social differences between the terms. The *ḫapiru* are composed of different ethnic groups, whereas *'iḇrî* defines a specific ethnic group. The term *ḫapiru* is primarily a social classification for a certain element in society, while *'iḇrî* denotes neither social stratum nor social function.

A comparison of the Hebrew groups of the conquest period with the *ḫapiru* groups of the Amarna Tablets reveals considerable antitheses between the two groups. Israel kills or enslaves (as in the case of the Gibeonites) the indigenous population and occasionally spares cities before ultimately settling the land itself. By contrast, the *ḫapiru* were interested only in war booty.

Even though some scholars assert that the ethnic connotation of *'iḇrî* was actually only a secondary development of the original social status of a *ḫapiru* in the case of Abraham (e.g., Mendenhall), evidence militates against this theory. Abraham's actions in rescuing Lot are those not of a *ḫapiru* but of a kinsman, at least in the eyes of the biblical authors. One may thus propose hypothetically that although the essence of the term *ḫapiru* may originally have provided the foundation for the word *'iḇrî*, this connection had long been lost for the biblical writers themselves. But this proposal strains the etymological and philological evidence and ignores the extant witnesses. We conclude from this that the two terms are not related. The term *'iḇrî* is an ethnic term for proto-Israelites, descendants of Eber, and a gentilic term deriving from *'ēḇer*, "territory beyond," i.e., Mesopotamia, Abraham's original homeland.

Freedman — Willoughby

In many respects, the results of Loretz's monograph deviate from these findings. According to Loretz, all biblical occurrences of *'iḇrî(m)* are to be dated to the postexilic period, and refer thus to "those belonging to the postexilic Jewish community."[35] Reference to the PN "Eber" (Gen. 11:14-17 [P]) represents the attempt to explain the gentilic noun and its origin within postexilic language. Use of the eponym "Eber" by J in 10:21,25 does not necessarily contradict this. Although *'iḇrî* may indeed derive etymologically from *ḫapiru*, the enormous temporal difference renders any direct relationship inconceivable and any postulation of semantic proximity unreasonable.

In his review of Loretz's book, where he calls this late dating into question, W. von Soden points out that in Gen. 14:13 (LXX *perátēs*), the term *'iḇrî* can mean "the man from beyond (the Jordan)," which effectively eliminates this particular passage from any discussion of the Hebrews in any case.[36]

Fabry

---

35. Pp. 181f.
36. W. von Soden, review of *Habiru-Hebräer* by O. Loretz, *UF* 16 (1985) 364ff.

IX. LXX. The term *'ibrî* occurs 34 times in the OT, and the LXX translates the word 28 times as *Hebraíos/a,* "Hebrew," as either an adjective or a substantive according to context. In the remaining 6 passages, the term *'bdym* (LXX *hoi doúloi*), "the slaves," is confused with *'brym* (1 S. 13:3; 14:21). In 1 S. 29:3, MT *mâ hā'ibrîm hā'ēlleh,* "What are these Hebrews doing here?" the LXX translates *tínes hoi diaporeuómenoi hoútoi,* "What are these passers-by doing here?" The Philistine commanders ask this question when they see David and his men passing by in the rear with Achish *(pareporeúonto* for the ptcp. *'ōbᵉrîm)* just as they themselves set out *(pareporeúonto* again for the ptcp. *'ōbᵉrîm).* The translators of 1 S. 29:2f. probably confused *'ibrîm ('brym)* in v. 3 with *'ōbᵉrîm ('brym)* in v. 2 (bis) and simply added on another prefix *(dia-)* to the root *(poreúō),* which had already appeared twice in quick succession.

A variation of the confusion between *'ibrî/'ebed* appears in Jon. 1:9. The MT *'ibrî 'ānōkî wᵉet-YHWH 'ᵉlōhê haššāmayim 'ᵃnî yārē',* "I am a Hebrew and worship Yahweh, the God of heaven," becomes *Doúlos kyríou egṓ eimi kaí tón kýrion théon toú ouranoú egṓ sébomai,* "I am a servant of the Lord and worship the Lord, the God of heaven." The LXX reads *'br* as *'bd (doúlos),* but now the translator must add *kyríou* to clarify to whom this service is rendered. This confusion was probably also influenced by the theological popularity of the expression "servant of the Lord" at the time of the translation.

Finally and most significantly, the LXX translates Gen. 14:13, "Abram the Hebrew," with *Abram tṓ perátē,* "Abram the wanderer (Abram the emigrant?)." This may be a conscious attempt to explain the etymology of *'ibrî* (as deriving from *'br,* "cross over, pass through") and in so doing to provide an appellative based on Abraham's emigration and the patriarchs' pastoral lives. Because the Hebrew Abraham was never dependent on or subject to a foreigner, the translator may have taken the unusual element of this passage into consideration and thus translated it differently.

Freedman — Willoughby

עֵגֶל *'ēgel;* עֶגְלָה *'eglâ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Extrabiblical Occurrences: 1. Ugarit; 2. Inscriptions. III. OT: 1. Concrete References; 2. Metaphors and Comparisons; 3. Golden Calf and Bull Cult. IV. *'eglâ.* V. 1. Qumran; 2. LXX.

'ēgel. M. Aberbach and L. Smolar, "Aaron, Jeroboam, and the Golden Calves," *JBL* 86 (1967) 129-40; L. R. Bailey, "The Golden Calf," *HUCA* 42 (1971) 97-115; W. Beyerlin, *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions* (Eng. trans., Oxford, 1966); J. Debus, *Die Sünde Jerobeams. FRLANT,* 93 (1967); C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot: Seine Entstehung und seine Entwicklung im AT. BBB* 62 (1985), esp. 147-53; O. Eissfeldt, "Lade und Stierbild," *ZAW* 58 (1940/41) 190-215 =

I. 1. *Etymology.* Heb. *'ēgel,* "calf" (or perhaps better "young bull, ox"), is in all likelihood a primary noun and thus does not derive from *'gl,* "be round," or Arab. *'aǵila,* "hurry, hasten."[1] It corresponds to Ugar. *'gl,* Phoen. and Old Aram. *'gl,* Syr. *'eglā,* Arab. *'iǵl,* Eth. *ĕgʷĕl,* and perhaps OSA *'gl.*[2] The word is not found in Akkadian.

2. *Occurrences.* The word *'ēgel* occurs 35 times in the OT, the fem. *'eglâ,* "young cow, heifer," 12 times. Lev. 9:2 specifies *'ēgel* as *ben-bāqār.* An alternative to simple *'eglâ* is in several instances *'eglaṯ bāqār* (Dt. 21:3; 1 S. 16:2; Isa. 7:21).

II. Extrabiblical Occurrences.

1. *Ugarit.* In Ugaritic texts *'gl* occurs 3 times in the concrete sense in the comparison "as a cow *('rḫ)* bellows to its calf," or "like the heart of a cow for her calf, like the heart of a ewe for her lamb, so's the heart of Anath for Baal."[3] Similarly concrete use of *'gl* occurs in reference to the killing of oxen, sheep, bulls, rams, and yearling calves.[4] Although one passage speaks about *npš 'gl,* it is damaged and incomprehensible.[5] Additionally, *'gl* occurs together with Yamm, Nahar, the Dragon *(tnn),* and the fleeing serpent as Ba'al's enemy,[6] though it is not entirely clear whether these represent different names of the same enemy or several different enemies.

Finally, the fem. *'glt* appears in a puzzling passage stating that shortly before his death Ba'al "desired a cow *(prt)* in the wilderness steppe *(dbr),* a heifer on the edge of the wilderness *(bšd šḫl mmṯ),*"[7] the result being that "she conceives and gives birth to a

---

KlSchr, II (1963), 282-305; F. C. Fensham, "The Burning of the Golden Calf and Ugarit," *IEJ* 16 (1966) 191-93; R. Gnuse, "Calf, Cult and King: The Unity of Hosea 8:1-13," *BZ* 26 (1982) 83-92; J. Hahn, *Das Goldene Kalb: Die Jahwe-Verehrung bei Stierbildern in der Geschichte Israels. EHS* 23/154 (1981); S. Lehming, "Versuch zu Ex xxxii," *VT* 10 (1960) 16-50; J. Lewy, "The Story of the Golden Calf Reanalysed," *VT* 9 (1959) 318-22; S. E. Loewenstamm, "The Making and Destruction of the Golden Calf," *Bibl* 48 (1967) 481-90; H. Motzki, "Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Stierkultes in der Religionsgeschichte Israels," *VT* 25 (1975) 470-85; M. Noth, "Zur Anfertigung des goldenen Kalbes," *VT* 9 (1959) 419-22; H. Schmid, *Mose, Überlieferung und Geschichte. BZAW* 110 (1968), esp. 81-85; H. Seebass, *Mose und Aaron, Sinai und Gottesberg* (Bonn, 1962), esp. 33ff.; H. Utzschneider, *Hosea, Prophet vor dem Ende: Zum Verhältnis von Geschichte und Institution in der alttestamentlichen Prophetie. OBO* 31 (1980); M. Weippert, "Gott und Stier," *ZDPV* 77 (1961) 93-117; W. Zimmerli, "Das Bilderverbot in der Geschichte des alten Israel," *Schalom: FS A. Jepsen. AzT* 1/46 (1971), 86-96 = *Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie und Prophetie. Gesammelte Aufsätze* 2. *ThB* 51 (1974), 247-60.

1. *HAL,* II, 784. Cf. *GesB,* 585; W. Eilers, "Zur Funktion von Nominalformen," *WO* 3 (1964) 132.

2. See *WUS,* no. 1995; *DNSI,* II, 824; Biella, 351.

3. *KTU,* 1.15, I 5; I.6, II 7, 28; *ANET,* 140.

4. *KTU,* 1.22, I 13; cf. 1.4, VI 42.

5. *KTU,* 1.5, V 4.

6. *KTU,* 1.3, II 44.

7. *KTU,* 1.5, V 18f.; translation according to K. Aartun, "Neue Beiträge zum ugaritischen Lexikon I," *UF* 16 (1984) 46. Cf. *ANET,* 139: "He desires a cow-calf in Dubr, a heifer in Shihlmemat-field *(šd šḫlmmt).*"

son *(mt).*" The heifer possibly represents the goddess ʿAnat, and the text may be alluding to a *hieros gamos* ceremony.

2. *Inscriptions.* Among inscriptional witnesses, the Marseilles Tariff mentions the *ʿgl* as a sacrificial animal, and a Sefire text as an animal cut into pieces *(gzr)* symbolizing and (magically) invoking the identical fate of partners who violate the contract.[8] The Sefire text also apparently refers to similar punishment for breach of contract and describes a situation when "seven cows shall suckle a calf, and it shall not be sated . . . [and] seven ewes shall suckle a lamb, and it shall not be sated."

III. OT.

1. *Concrete References.* First of all, the term *'ēgel* is used in the straightforward concrete sense in the OT. 1 S. 28:24 recounts that the medium at Endor "had a fatted calf in the house," which she slaughtered and served to Saul and his servants. Am. 6:4 censures the carefree and self-confident who eat lambs and "calves from the stall" at their banquets. The sacrificial animals at Aaron's first sacrifice in Lev. 9:2,8 include a calf as a sin offering, as well as a male goat, a calf, and a lamb as an offering of the people (v. 3). Legislation does not otherwise mention calves as sacrificial animals; only in Mic. 6:6 do the listeners offer to sacrifice yearling calves, something the prophet rejects in a well-known verse, since Yahweh requires only ethical actions (v. 8).

Jer. 34:18f. discusses the agreement for releasing slaves. Because the agreement is violated, Jeremiah announces that Yahweh will inflict punishment by "making [those who violated the agreement] like the calf when they cut it in two *(kārat)* and passed between its parts *(beṯer).*"[9] Jeremiah seems to be alluding to a custom similar to that described in the Sefire inscription (see above). At the same time, he may be alluding to Gen. 15:9-11,17f., where Abraham cuts in two a three-year-old calf (*btr* piel; *'eglâ,* actually a young heifer), a goat, and a ram, "laying each half over against the other." In what follows, it is not Abraham himself but a smoking firepot and a flaming torch that pass between the pieces *(beṯer).* Thus does Yahweh, who is apparently present in the firepot and torch, obligate himself to a covenant with Abraham.[10]

2. *Metaphors and Comparisons.* The term *'ēgel* is also used in metaphors and comparisons. According to Jer. 46:21, although Egypt's mercenaries are like fatted calves who have eaten their fill in the prosperous land,[11] they will be unable to withstand the Babylonian assault. This comparison is related to the description of Egypt itself as a beautiful heifer (*'eglâ,* v. 20). Mal. 3:20(Eng. 4:2) compares those who will experience the coming time of salvation with calves that leave their stalls and leap for joy. The imagery in Ps. 29:6 has slightly different implications insofar as Lebanon skips like a calf and Sirion like a young wild ox at the presence of Yahweh in a storm. Ezekiel is quite

---

8. See, respectively, *KAI,* 69, 5; 222 A, 40; A, 23; for both passages, see *ANET,* 659f.
9. Translation according to W. Rudolph, *Jeremia. HAT* I/12 (^{3}1968), in loc.; also NRSV.
10. Concerning this passage, cf. also → עז *'ēz.*
11. Rudolph, *Jeremia,* in loc.

prosaic in comparing the soles of the creatures around Yahweh's throne with those of a calf's foot (Ezk. 1:7). In Jer. 31:18 Ephraim complains that Yahweh disciplined him as one does an untrained *(lō' lummāḏ)* calf. A similar expression, though used differently, appears in Hos. 10:11, where Ephraim is "a trained heifer *('eglâ m^e lummāḏâ)* that loved to thresh," and that Yahweh was unable to use for his own purposes.

One metaphor for the peace initiated by the coming salvific king is the cohabitation of calves and lions (Isa. 11:6); i.e., predators will no longer devour domestic animals. In describing the desolation of the cosmopolitan city, Isa. 27:10 says that calves will graze there; the city is "deserted and forsaken, like the wilderness." By contrast, Ps. 68:31(30) is utterly obscure. The animals living among the reeds and the herd of bulls (strong ones? *'abbîr)* with the calves of the peoples are to be threatened *(gā'ar),* trampled, and scattered. (Perhaps one ought to read *ba'^a lê 'ammîm,* "the lords of the peoples," instead of *b^e 'eglê 'ammîm.)*

3. *Golden Calf and Bull Cult.* The remaining occurrences refer to the "golden calf" (Ex. 32) and the "bull cult" in the northern kingdom (1 K. 12; Hos.).[12]

While Moses lingers on Mt. Sinai, the Israelites make a golden calf (from wood with gold overlay?), which they call the "gods (!) who brought you up out of the land of Egypt" (Ex. 32:4), and to whom they bring burnt offerings (vv. 4-6). Upon returning and seeing what has happened, Moses becomes enraged, shatters the tablets of the law, and destroys the calf.[13] Dt. 9:16,21 as well as Ps. 106:19 and Neh. 9:18 all refer to this event.

The sentence "these are your gods, etc." establishes a connection with 1 K. 12:28, i.e., with the story of Jeroboam's cultic transgression of setting up the two "calves" (i.e., bull images) in Bethel and Dan (mentioned again in 2 K. 10:29; 17:16; cf. 2 Ch. 11:15; 13:8).[14]

Because the present text assesses both Jeroboam's golden calf and the bull images negatively, interpreters have often surmised that Ex. 32 was created in order to condemn the later bull cult. Ex. 32, however, is hardly a unified composition. In v. 8 Moses receives news from Yahweh about what has happened, while in vv. 17 and 19 he learns of it only when descending the mountain.[15] Interpreters ascribe the chapter's foundation to either J or E or to a JE source from the northern kingdom.[16] Although vv. 7-14 resonate with Deuteronomistic elements, they deviate from Dt. 9:25ff. Vv. 21-34 also seem to contain heterogeneous elements.

According to J. P. Hyatt, the chapter originated as follows.[17] The earliest narrative

---

12. → שׁוֹר *šôr.*

13. Cf. Fensham.

14. Concerning the connection between Ex. 32 and 1 K. 12, see Dohmen.

15. A different view is taken by B. Childs, *The Book of Exodus. OTL* (1974), 559.

16. J: Noth, Childs; E: Beyerlin, 126-33; J. P. Hyatt, *Exodus. NCBC* (1971), 301; JE source: Dohmen, 127; cf. also J. Loza, "Exode XXXII et la rédaction JE," *VT* 23 (1973) 31-55, who ascribes it to R^{JE}.

17. Hyatt, *Exodus,* 300ff.

was the cult legend of the bull cult in Bethel, in which Aaron played a positive role. This cult legend probably predates the time of Jeroboam. In any event, the latter took over an earlier cult in Bethel. The Jeroboam story probably influenced the present narrative (only the former [v. 28] actually mentions two calves/gods; the pl. does not fit Ex. 32:4). In its present form the narrative is critical of Aaron and must come from a time after prophets like Hosea had already criticized the bull cult in Bethel. Although vv. 21-24 try to rehabilitate Aaron, they do not yet represent the position of P. Vv. 25-29 establish the priestly function of the Levites by referring to their loyalty to Yahweh; this piece either is connected with Deuteronomy or comes from Levitical circles in the northern kingdom. Moses' second intercession (vv. 30-34) has nothing to do with the first (vv. 11-14); v. 34 might be alluding to the northern kingdom; the idea of individual responsibility recalls Ezekiel, though it also may be older. Vv. 7-14 are a result of Deuteronomistic redaction.

According to C. Dohmen, an older basic narrative from circles associated with the prophecy of the northern kingdom provided the JE source in taking as its theme a leadership conflict between Moses and some leadership symbol directed against Yahweh.[18] JE then intensifies the adoption of prophetic critique (Hosea) and identifies this symbol with the calf of Bethel (vv. 4aβ,19,24bβ,35). Hence JE restructured the narrative into the fundamental, negative qualification of bull worship, which JE believes caused the fall of the northern kingdom. A Deuteronomistic redactor, inspired by Dt. 9f. and by the prohibition against images in the Decalog, creates the connection with 1 K. 12 and with the Covenant Code (vv. 7-14,20,31b), viewing "Jeroboam's sin" as a continuation and intensification of Israel's own basic sin. A concluding reworking in the priestly spirit by R^P (vv. 15b-18,26-29,32,33*-35*) carries out the reassessment and rehabilitation of Aaron.[19]

As far as 1 K. 12 is concerned, it is thus possible that Jeroboam, rather than creating a new cult, took over one that already existed (at least in Bethel). Archaeological evidence makes it less likely that the "calves" were understood as images of gods themselves; they were more likely pedestals for the (here probably invisible) god.[20] Jeroboam's intention was apparently to provide his subjects with a substitute for the Jerusalem cult, not to introduce a new god. The Deuteronomistic history, however, condemns this cult as apostasy from Yahweh and calls it "the sin of Jeroboam."[21]

Hosea vigorously opposed this cult, accusing the people of having made idols (*ʿaṣabbîm*) from their silver and gold (God's gifts; see 2:10[8]) (8:4), and insisting that "your calf is rejected,[22] O Samaria; my anger burns against them . . . the calf of Samaria

---

18. Pp. 126ff., 141-53.

19. J. Vermeylen, "L'affaire du veau d'or," *ZAW* 97 (1985) 1-23, is unpersuasive in trying to understand Ex. 32 as an early exilic invention that was reworked in four stages by a Deuteronomistic redactor.

20. Weippert; see bulls as pedestals for the Hittite weather god; for God on a bull in Hazor, see Y. Yadin, *Hazor,* 4 vols. in 3 (Jerusalem, 1958-64), II-IV, pls. CCCXXIVf.

21. Cf. Debus.

22. See J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* XXIV (1983), in loc.

shall be broken to pieces" (vv. 5a,6b; v. 6a, which refers to the idols as a human product and as a nongod, is perhaps a theologizing addendum). Noteworthy features here include the connection with kingship in v. 4a and the association of "spurning, rejecting," with v. 3a, namely, the idea that Israel has "spurned the good," and now Yahweh rejects the calf. The prophet's words breathe passionate despair: "How long will they be incapable of innocence?" (v. 5c). By contrast, in 10:5f. the tone is mocking: "The inhabitants of Samaria seek protection *(gûr)* with the calf-thing [*'eglôṯ,* hardly the pl. of *'eglâ,* perhaps to be pointed as *'eglûṯ*][23] of Beth-aven [i.e., Bethel]." Although there is mourning and exultation, probably over the death and resurrection of the god conceived here as Ba'al, the god's (idol's) glory *(kāḇôḏ)* will be carried to Assyria as tribute, and "Ephraim shall be put to shame" (vv. 5f.). Here, too, the connection with kingship is discernible (vv. 3,7). Hos. 13:2 speaks about cast images[24] and idols *('ᵃṣabbîm)* as Israel's continuing sin ("they keep on sinning"). An addendum identifies these idols as "the work of artisans," and the verse concludes with the derisive cry, "People are kissing calves!" This final sentence probably refers to small, privately owned statuettes rather than to larger cultic images.[25] V. 4 then contrasts the worship of idols with Yahweh, who has been Israel's only God since the exodus from Egypt (note the resonance with the beginning of the Decalog).

IV. *'eglâ.* The fem. form *'eglâ* is used in the concrete sense in Dt. 21:3,4,6. When a murder has been committed but the perpetrator is not known, a heifer "that has never been worked, one that has not pulled in the yoke," is to be taken into an unplowed wadi with running water and killed there, thus removing the guilt in some magical fashion.[26] 1 S. 16:2 mentions a heifer as a sacrifice.[27]

According to Isa. 7:21, even though a young cow and two sheep will constitute a man's livestock, they will give an abundance of milk. Jer. 50:11 describes the joy at Babylon's plundering as "frisking about like a heifer *('eglâ)* on the grass and neighing like stallions." Samson speaks in a riddle to the men of the feast who have solved his riddle with the help of his wife, "If you had not plowed with my heifer, you would not have found out my riddle." Here the word *'eglâ* thus refers to a young woman. Jer. 46:20 describes Egypt as a beautiful heifer upon which a gadfly from the north (Babylon) lights, a graphic metaphor from the animal world. This may or may not be alluding to the cow goddess Hathor. By contrast, the comparison of mercenaries with fatted calves (see above) doubtless involves wordplay with *'eglâ.* (See above concerning Gen. 15:9 and Hos. 10:11.)

V. 1. *Qumran.* The word *'ēgel* occurs only once in Qumran and means "larvae of bees" *('gl hdbwrym)* that may not be eaten (CD 12:12). 11QT 63:2 uses *'eglâ* in a citation from Dt. 21.

---

23. So W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966); and Jeremias, *Hosea,* in loc.
24. → מסכה *massēḵâ* (VIII, 431-37).
25. Jeremias, *Hosea,* in loc.
26. → נחל *naḥal* (IX, 335-40).
27. Concerning the ox as a sacrificial animal, → בקר *bāqār* (II, 209-16); → פר *par.*

2. *LXX.* The LXX usually translates *ʿēgel* with *móschos* or *moschárion,* and *ʿeglâ* with *dámalis.* Peculiarly, Jeroboam's "calves" are rendered with *dámalis* (cf., however, 2 Ch. 11:15; 13:8 with *móschos*). In Jer. 50:11 *ʿeglâ* is translated as *boídion.*

Ringgren

עֲגָלָה *ʿᵃgālâ*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. OT: 1. Transport Wagons; 2. In the Cult; 3. Harvest Wagons; 4. Metaphors. III. Qumran and LXX.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The word *ʿᵃgālâ* is a feminine noun construction deriving from the root *ʿgl,* which occurs in the OT only in nominal derivatives (*ʿāgîl,* designation for a round decorative ornament; *ʿāgōl,* "round"; *maʿgāl,* "defensive circle of wagons" and "track, wagon track"; and **ʿᵃgilâ,* "round shield"[1]); its basic meaning is "be round, describe a circle." The term *ʿᵃgālâ,* "wagon," is thus derived synecdochically from the wheel as its main component. Because Hebrew distinguishes between the chariot drawn by horses (*merkāḇâ* and → **רכב** *rkb, reḵeḇ*) on the one hand, and the transport wagon drawn by oxen on the other (*ʿᵃgālâ*), one may assume that in addition to the root *ʿgl* the resonance with *ʿeglâ,* "heifer," and *ʿēgel,* "calf," also played a role in the choice of names.

A fragmentary Phoenician inscription from Kition on Cypress contains the combination *ḥrš ʿglt,* which is to be understood as a vocational designation in the sense of "cartwright, coachmaker, wheelwright."[2] In a Punic inscription from Carthage, the name of the founder of the inscription is followed by the expression *ʿglt ʿṣ,* i.e., "wooden wagon."[3] Since the analogy of Punic inscriptions shows that this cannot involve a sacrificial offering, one is inclined to view this, too, as the vocational identification of the founder as in the case of the Punic inscription just cited; either the word *ḥrš* was omitted, or the word for "producer" is logically to be supplied according to the sense, so that here, too, the reference is to a cartwright or maker of wooden wagons.

The Aramaic linguistic sphere contains numerous witnesses of the word for wagon, including Syr. *ʿāgaltāʾ,* Christian Palestinian and Mand. *ʿgla,* and Jewish Aram. *ʿᵃgaltāʾ.*[4]

ʿᵃgālâ. G. Prausnitz, *Der Wagen in der Religion; seine Würdigung in der Kunst. Studien zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte* 187 (Strassburg, 1916); M. Rodinson, "ʿAḏjala," *Encyclopaedia of Islam,* 9 vols. (new ed. 1960-97), I, 205f.; A. Salonen, *Die Landfahrzeuge des alten Mesopotamien. AnAcScFen* B 72/3 (1951); H. Weippert, "Wagen," *BRL*², 356; J. Wiesner, "Wagen," *BHHW,* III (1966), 2127-30.

1. See in this regard the discussion of Ps. 46:10(Eng. v. 9) below.
2. *RES,* 1207, 2. Cf. *ḥrš ʾrnt* in *CIS,* 3333.
3. *CIS,* 346, 3.
4. See, respectively, *LexSyr,* 510; F. Schulthess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (Berolini, 1903), 142b, secondary form of *ʿāgeltāʾ; MdD,* 341a; *WTM,* 201b.

In Samaritan the corresponding form is *ʿāgēla.*[5] The Mishnah (*Kelim* 24.2) distinguishes three different types of wagons: one made like a throne, one made like a bed, and one made for carrying stones. The small wagon *(ʿglh)* for rams, which saves the heavy, drooping, fat tail from being soiled or harmed and which is mentioned in both the Mishnah (*Šabb.* 5.4) and Talmud (*b. Šabb.* 54b), is also attested in Herodotus (3.113, as *hamaxís*) as one of Arabia's curiosities.

Arabic distinguishes three homonymous roots *ʿgl:* (a) haste; (b) calf; (c) wheel. The word *ʿaǵalatun* with the meaning "wheel," and in extrapolation also "cart, wagon," or even "waterwheel," occurs relatively rarely. As a cultural word for an object with which the Bedouin were not familiar, it represents a loanword from the Northwest Semitic sphere.[6]

Coptic *aǵolte,* "wagon," suggests that an Egyptian word was the precursor of the Coptic version, and Late Egyp. *ʿagarata* is a likely candidate.[7] W. F. Albright suspects that a shift took place from an original *ʿa-ga-ar-ta.*[8] The transport wagon (both the word and the object were imported from Syria) was drawn by oxen and used for the transport of provisions to the mines.[9]

2. *Occurrences.* The word *ʿᵃgālâ* occurs altogether 25 times in the OT, including twice each in 5 different verses (Nu. 7:3; 1 S. 6:7,14; 2 S. 6:3 par. 1 Ch. 13:7). The occurrences can be classified further according to specific textual groups (4 times in Gen. 45f.; 5 in Nu. 7; 7 in 1 S. 6; otherwise also 2 S. 6:3 par. 1 Ch. 13:7; Isa. 5:18; 28:27,28; Am. 2:13; and Ps. 46:10[9]).

II. OT.

1. *Transport Wagons.* Gen. 45:19,21,27; 46:5 all refer to Egyptian transport wagons.[10] To facilitate the move from Canaan to Egypt, Joseph sends his father Jacob transport wagons, on which especially women, children, and his elderly father (45:19; 46:5) are to travel.[11] A literary-critical question remains concerning a "wagon version" and a "donkey version" (45:17,23).[12] In Jth. 15:11, too, mules and wagons are used together for transporting spoils.

---

5. Cf. Z. Ben Ḥayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans,* 5 vols. (Jerusalem, 1957-77), IV, 201.

6. Cf. Rodinson.

7. See W. E. Crum, *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford, 1929), 26; cf. *WbÄS,* I, 236.

8. *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography. AOS* 5 (1934), 38.

9. A. Erman and H. Ranke, *Life in Ancient Egypt* (Eng. trans., New York, 1969), 491; J. H. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt,* 5 vols. (Chicago, 1906-7), IV, 227.

10. Cf. P. Montet, *Everyday Life in Egypt in the Days of Ramesses the Great* (Eng. trans., London, 1958), 172; Erman and Ranke, *Life in Ancient Egypt,* 408.

11. Cf. also *ANEP,* no. 167.

12. Cf. H. Donner, *Die literarische Gestalt der alttestamentlichen Josephsgeschichte. SHAW Phil.-hist. Kl.* (1976:2), 20f., 24; H.-C. Schmitt, *Die nichtpriesterliche Josephsgeschichte. BZAW* 154 (1980), 55 n. 225.

2. *In the Cult.* a. Nu. 7:3(bis),6,7,8 also refer to transport wagons. The twelve tribal leaders present altogether six wagons, described more closely as *ʿeglōṯ ṣāḇ* (7:3), each of which is drawn by two oxen. These are to be put at the disposal of the Levites for transporting the wilderness sanctuary; indeed, the Kohathites receive none because they are to carry the holy things on their shoulders (cf. 4:4ff.), whereas the Gershonites receive two wagons for the tabernacle covering, curtains, and hangings (cf. 4:25f.), and the Merarites four wagons for the frames of the tabernacle and all other necessary equipment (cf. 4:31f.). The word *ṣāḇ* specifies the wagons more closely, and is associated with Akk. *ṣumbu* or *ṣubbu,*[13] "wagon, wheel" (in Late Babylonian, this is the designation for the ox-drawn, two-wheeled Elamite transport wagon). The pl. form *ṣabbîm* in Isa. 66:20 stands in a series of transport means after horses and chariots and before mules and the *kirkārôṯ* (female camels? dromedaries [so NRSV]? or a certain kind of wagon?), and is understood by LXX *(lampḗnai),* Aquila, and Theodotion as "covered wagon," whereas the Vulg., Symmachus, and the Targs. understand it as litters. The LXX, Aquila, Vulg., and Targ.^{0} as well as Rashi also understand "covered wagon" to be intended in Nu. 7:3.

Ps. 46:10(9) praises Yahweh as the one who "breaks the bow, and shatters the spear, and burns the wagons with fire." The term *ʿᵃgālôṯ* hẹre cannot refer to chariots,[14] since *markāḇôṯ* is used in that case (concerning the burning of chariots, cf. Josh. 11:6,9). Accordingly, scholars since F. Baethgen have been inclined to point the word as *ʿᵃgilôṯ,* since the LXX *(thyreoús)* and Targs. *(ʿgylyn)* obviously read *ʿᵃgilâ,* "round shield," here, a word not otherwise attested in Biblical Hebrew (cf. 1QM 6:15, *mgny ʿglh,* "round shield").[15] If one does want to preserve the MT *ʿᵃgālôṯ,* one can follow H. Schmid in understanding this as a reference to those particular transport wagons of critical importance for the retinue of any army.[16]

b. According to Josh. 3:3,6,8,13,14,15,17; 4:9,10,18, priests (according to 3:3, the Levitical priests) carry the ark, and according to Nu. 4:5f.,15, only the Kohathites among the Levites are permitted to carry the ark with poles and without touching it after the priests have carefully packed it up. When the ark is returned by the Philistines, however, a new wagon (NRSV "cart") is used and is drawn by "two milch cows that have never borne a yoke" (1 S. 6:7). The young cows, whose calves were left behind in their stalls, proceed straight in the direction of Beth-shemesh, "lowing as they went" (1 S. 6:12), but "turning neither to the right nor to the left" despite the difficulties. Upon arrival, the wood of the cart is split and both the wood and the cows are offered as a burnt offering to Yahweh (1 S. 6:14). According to 2 S. 6:2f. par. 1 Ch. 13:6f., too, the ark is transported from Kiriath-jearim to Jerusalem on a new wagon not yet profaned by work *(ʿᵃgālâ ḥᵃḏāšâ)* and drawn by oxen (2 S. 6:6). In an accident the oxen

---

13. *CAD,* XVI, 244f.; *AHw,* III, 1111b.

14. So H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), in loc.

15. *Die Psalmen. HKAT* II/2 (²1897), 132.

16. Schmidt, *Die Psalmen. HAT* I/15 (1934), 88. Cf. also R. Bach, ". . . der Bogen zerbricht, Spiesse zerschlägt und Wagen mit Feuer verbrennt," *Probleme biblischer Theologie. FS G. von Rad* (Munich, 1971), 16 n. 11.

begin to totter and are about to fall. Uzzah, son of Abinadab, who previously guarded the ark, is going along next to the ark and reaches for it when he fears it will fall from the cart, and Yahweh strikes him dead. Only after a three-month interim at the home of Obed-edom in Gath is the ark then taken by bearers (6:13) to Jerusalem without being placed on a cart again.

3. *Harvest Wagons.* Isa. 28:23-29 is an "artistically constructed wisdom poem" whose purpose is "to inform us how marvelously Yahweh instructs the farmer, so that he can carry out all his activities in the right order and with the appropriate tools."[17] In so doing, it mentions the cart wheel *'ôpan ʿagālâ* (v. 27) in connection with threshing work parallel with the threshing sledge *(ḥārûṣ),* and also mentions the farmer's cart wheel and horses (*gilgal ʿeglāṯô ûpārāšaw,* v. 28). This text has given rise to suspicions that in antiquity one had access not only to the threshing sledge proper *(ḥārûṣ)* and the board attached to the underside to which were fixed sharp stones or iron teeth and on top of which the farmer stood and guided the draught animals, but also to a threshing cart analogous to the complicated cart imported to Palestine from Egypt only in modern times.[18] This mention of wagon wheels recalls A. Salonen's thesis regarding Mesopotamia: "that farmers dismantled the disklike wheels from the carts that carried the grain from the field to the threshing floor, laid them flat on the sheaves spread out on the floor, and had draught animals draw them like a threshing sledge across the sheaves."[19] Despite the opinion of *HAL* and H. Wildberger, however, H. Gese is probably correct in assuming that the term *ʿagālâ* can refer only to the transport wagon as a harvest wagon, not to a threshing cart or threshing cylinder.[20]

Finally, the text seems to imply that a transport wagon required for agricultural work was drawn by horses. This mention of horses is peculiar insofar as in antiquity farmers did not use horses for agricultural fieldwork; and though horses have sometimes been used in modern times for threshing in Palestine,[21] this cannot be applied to antiquity without qualification. The MT is probably not referring to draught horses (as a rule, the reference in such cases is to *sûs*), but, quite independently of wagons, to riding horses (as suggested by the expression *pārāš*). Of course, the MT may not be entirely without flaws in the first place; the reading may be *ûpᵉrāśô.*[22]

4. *Metaphors.* Wagons also appear in metaphorical expressions. The threat of punishment in Am. 2:13 compares Yahweh's intervention with the splitting of the earth by an overloaded harvest wagon. "Amos compares the furrowing and tearing open of the

---

17. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 258.
18. *AuS,* III, 88-91, illustrations 21-25.
19. *Agricultura Mesopotamica nach sumerisch-akkadischen Quellen. AnAcScFen* B 149 (1968), 170-83. See Weippert, *BRL*², 64.
20. Gese, "Kleine Beiträge zum Verständnis des Amosbuches," *VT* 12 (1962) 419, 421f. Cf. *HAL,* II, 785; Wildberger, *Jesaja (28–39). BK* X/3 (1982), 1094.
21. F. A. Klein, *ZDPV* 4 (1881) 77.
22. Cf. *BHS;* Wildberger, *Jesaja (28–39),* 1084f.

earth by the heavily laden wagon with the corresponding phenomena associated with the earthquake that Yahweh will visit upon the Israelites."[23] Here, as in Isa. 28:27, *ʿagālâ* refers to a harvest wagon rather than to a threshing cart.[24]

Isa. 5:18 compares the behavior of real estate speculators (5:8) and revelers (5:11) with that of people who unavoidably draw in guilt and sin as if with the cart ropes *(kaʿabôṯ hāʿagālâ)* with which draught animals are additionally tethered from the yoke to the wagon. Sir. 33:5 (LXX 36:5; the text is emended according to the LXX) compares the heart of a fool with a cart wheel, and his thoughts with the turning axle.[25]

III. Qumran and LXX. The LXX renders *ʿagālâ* 22 times with *hámaxa,* "transport wagon." In Isa. 5:18 it has *dámalis* = *ʿeglâ;* 28:28 lacks an equivalent. In Ps. 46:10(9) the rendering *thyreoí,* "round shields," suggests the reading *ʿagilôṯ* instead of *ʿagālôṯ* (see above). The Vulg. always translates *ʿagālâ* as *plaustrum* with the exception of Ps. 46:10(9), where it follows the LXX with *scuta,* "shields."

The LXX uses *hámaxa* in 3 other passages as well: in Isa. 41:15 and 1 Ch. 21:23 as the translation for *môrag,* and in Isa. 25:10 in a free rendering of the MT. These 3 passages are often adduced as suggesting the existence of a "threshing wagon/cart."[26] A different picture, however, emerges when one views the Greek texts without the aid of the Hebrew source texts. 1 Ch. 21:23 might be referring to harvest wagons parked next to the threshing floor. Isa. 25:10 uses the treading of grain by wagons as a metaphor for destruction. Finally, in Isa. 41:15 the addendum "having teeth," *pristēroeidḗs,* might be alluding to the scythe chariots used by the Seleucid army as mentioned, e.g., in 2 Mc. 13:2. None of these 3 passages refers unequivocally to threshing wagons.

The word *ʿagālâ* plays no role in the Qumran texts.

Kellermann†

---

23. H. Gese, "Kleine Beiträge zum Verständnis des Amosbuches," *VT* 12 (1962) 422.

24. Contra *HAL,* II, 785.

25. Concerning the textual problems in this passage, cf. V. Ryssel, in E. Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des ATs,* 2 vols. (Tübingen, 1900; repr. 1962), I, 395.

26. Cf. *AuS,* III, 88f.; J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias. ATA* XII/3 (1934), 185ff.

עַד *'ad*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. OT: 1 Occurrences: a. Prepositional Phrases; b. Adverbial Accusative; c. Construct Expressions; 2. Parallel Expressions; 3. Theological Considerations. III. LXX. IV. Qumran.

I. Etymology. The noun *'ad* occurs only with prepositions *(lā'ad, ʿadê-'ad, 'ad-'ôlᵉmê 'ad, minnî-'ad),* as an adverbial accusative (*'ôlām wā'ed,* special pausal form),[1] and in construct combinations *(harᵉrê-'ad, 'ᵃbî-'ad, gᵉberet 'ad, šōkēn 'ad).* It can mean either "perpetual continuation, enduring future," or (with reference to the past) "from time immemorial." It is related etymologically in Hebrew to the prep. *'ad* and to the root *'dh,* "continue on, pass by," as well as to Arab. *ġad,* "the morrow, the following day."

M. Dahood's association of the noun *'ad* with Ugar. *'d,* "throne room, throne" (adducing in support Ps. 60:11[Eng. v. 9]; 89:30,38[29,37]; 93:5; 94:15; 110:1; Isa. 47:7; 57:15; Jer. 22:30; Zeph. 3:8), is neither linguistically secure nor really required by any of the passages adduced.[2] Dahood's other thesis has also been disproved, namely, the assumption of a DN *'ad,* "Eternal One," in the combination (by way of repointing following Ugar. *m'd;* cf. Heb. *mᵉ'ōd*) *'ad mā'ēd* allegedly in Ps. 119:8,43,51, not least because the meaning "large, great," for *m'd* is unattested in Ugaritic.[3]

II. OT.

1. *Occurrences.* a. *Prepositional Phrases.* Within the framework of Amos's oracle to the nations, an exilic prophet charges Edom with having "pursued his brother with the sword" (referring to the defenseless Judeans after the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C.) and with having perpetually *(lā'ad)* plundered him without ceasing from his anger (Am. 1:11). By contrast, a confession of trust made by the people of God from the early postexilic period emphasizes that Yahweh's anger does not last forever *(lā'ad)* but is temporally limited because God "delights in showing clemency" (Mic. 7:18). This is why during the preexilic period the people of God plead with Yahweh not to be exceedingly angry nor to remember his people's iniquity forever (*lā'ad,* Isa. 64:8[9]).

A psalmist similarly emphasizes in his own prayer that God does not always forget the needy, and thus the hope of the poor does not perish forever (*lā'ad,* Ps. 9:19[18]).

'ad. J. Barr, *Biblical Words for Time. SBT* 1/33 (²1969); M. Dahood, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 337-56; E. Jenni, "עַד *'ad* always," *TLOT,* II, 837f.; idem, "עוֹלָם *'ôlām* eternity," *TLOT,* II, 852-62; O. Loretz, "*'d m'd* 'Everlasting Grand One' in den Psalmen," *BZ* 16 (1972) 245-48.

1. Cf. *BLe,* 548.
2. Cf. Dahood, *Psalms 51–100. AB* 17 (1968), 81; *HAL,* II, 787ff.
3. Cf. Dahood, *Psalms 101–150. AB* 17A (1970), 174; Loretz; D. Marcus, "Evidence for 'The Almighty/The Grand One'?" *Bibl* 55 (1974) 404-7.

Quite the contrary, fear of Yahweh, consisting in following the divine ordinances, bestows enduring *(lā'aḏ)* stability to the believer (19:10[9]). In the divine salvific plan, however, it is the messianic king whom God has appointed to be the mediator of blessing for all eternity (*lā'aḏ*, 21:7[6]). A petitioner thus alludes to the divine fellowship attaching to the sacrificial meal in expressing the wish that the hearts of Yahweh's poor might be vivified forever (*la'aḏ*, 22:27[26]). Yet another petitioner, in considering the consummation of salvation, asserts that the righteous will possess the promised land and will live there for all time (*lā'aḏ*, 37:29). In offering thanksgiving in the temple, a petitioner hopes to abide forever (*'ôlāmîm*, v. 5) in God's tent, and there, in payment of his vow, to praise Yahweh's name always (*lā'aḏ*, 61:9[8]). With recourse to the earlier promise to Nathan, the exiled people remind Yahweh that he earlier promised to establish the rule of the line of David forever *(lā'aḏ)*, and to make their throne as enduring as the days of heaven itself (89:30[29]). Finally, in praising God's dominion in history, the people of God confess that both his revealed righteousness and his glory will endure forever and ever (*lā'aḏ le'ôlām*, 111:8; cf. also vv. 3,10). The same applies to the works of creation, which God established forever and ever (*lā'aḏ le'ôlām*, 148:6).

Job would like to see his words inscribed in stone with an iron chisel and lead, legible to everyone, preserved forever *(lā'aḏ)*, a witness to his innocence (Job 19:24). Wisdom confirms the everlasting value of truth by pointing out that "truthful lips endure forever *(lā'aḏ)*, but a lying tongue lasts only a moment" (Prov. 12:19). Similarly, the king's intervention on behalf of the poor enables his throne to endure forever (*lā'aḏ*, Prov. 29:14; cf. Ps. 89:30[29] above). By contrast, Solomon, David's son, should serve Yahweh with an undivided heart to escape everlasting *(lā'aḏ)* condemnation (1 Ch. 28:9).

Because Israel resists the instructions of Yahweh, their God, and exhibits a dangerous inclination to allow false prophets to harden them in their perversions, Isaiah is commissioned with writing down God's word in a book in the presence of his listeners as if in an inscription "for the time to come, as a witness forever *(lā'aḏ)*," indeed, for all eternity (Isa. 30:8; cf. Job 19:24 above). Contra the suggested reading *lā'ēḏ*, one should follow the MT here (probably also in substantive agreement with the LXX) in reading *lā'aḏ*, since "in the present form of the text the three definitions of time form a climax: for the future, for the farthest future, for the unending future."[4]

Following Yahweh's announcement that he will create a new heaven and a new earth, and that one no longer need remember former things, the redeemed are charged under the auspices of God's salvific dominion with rejoicing forever (*'aḏê-'aḏ*, Isa. 65:18). With regard to the consummation of salvation, the people of God thus confess their eternal *('aḏê-'aḏ)* trust in Yahweh, the everlasting rock (26:4).

In view of the anticipated revelation of Yahweh's dominion over the entire world, the oppressed people of God hope that their enemies will be put to shame and dismayed forever *('aḏê-'aḏ)* and then perish in disgrace (Ps. 83:18[17]). On the basis of

---

4. F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Comm. on the Prophecies of Isaiah*, 2 vols., *KD* VII (Eng. trans. 1890), II, 29.

the same salvific anticipation, one petitioner seeks consolation in the notion that although the wicked sprout like grass, God will ultimately destroy them forever (*ᵃdê-'ad,* 92:8[7]). By contrast, if David's descendants keep Yahweh's covenant, they will possess their father's throne forevermore *(ᵃdê-'ad),* for Yahweh has chosen Zion as his resting place forever (*ᵃdê-'ad,* 132:12,14). Against the background of the announcement of Yahweh's salvation for his people Israel, the redeemed thus receive the good news that to all eternity *('ad 'ôlᵉmê 'ad)* they need fear neither shame nor humiliation (Isa. 45:17).

Zophar asks Job whether he does not know that since the time of old *(minnî-'ad),* i.e., since the time God placed human beings on earth, the joy of the wicked lasts but a moment (Job 20:4). Here *'ad* refers to the past, albeit not as a fixed term but only in circumscribing an unlimited period of time, in this case reckoned backward from the observer's perspective.

b. *Adverbial Accusative.* According to Ps. 104:5, Yahweh as creator set the earth on foundations such that for all eternity *('ôlām wā'ed)* it will never be shaken. After Yahweh as the warrior against chaos defeats those who oppose his rule, he will be king in history forever and ever (*'ôlām wā'ed,* Ex. 15:18). Adducing this salvific deed in history through which God overcomes his enemies once and for all and extinguishes their names forever (*lᵉ'ôlām wā'ed,* Ps. 9:6[5]), the people confess that Yahweh will be king for all eternity *('ôlām wā'ed)* and will destroy all the pagan nations within the realm of his rule (10:16). This God Yahweh, who has revealed his kingship for all eternity, thus also deserves the eternal *(lᵉ'ôlām wā'ed)* praise of his believers (145:1,2,21).

As representative of Yahweh's eternal dominion, the messianic king participates in the salvific fullness of his God. According to a thanksgiving hymn at the election of the king, Yahweh thus fulfills the ruler's wish and grants him life forever and ever (*'ôlām wā'ed,* Ps. 21:5[4]). The throne of this ruler, too, will endure forever and ever *('ôlām wā'ed),* since Yahweh's righteousness will shape his rule (cf. Ps. 89:30[29] above; Prov. 29:14); accordingly, the nations will also praise Yahweh forever and ever (*'ôlām wā'ed,* Ps. 45:7,18[6,17]).

According to the book of Micah and in connection with the announcement of the nations' eschatological pilgrimage to Zion, the people of God will confess their identity to the nations as a people that "will walk in the name of Yahweh our God forever and ever" (*lᵉ'ôlām wā'ed,* Mic. 4:5). The people of God assembled on Zion similarly confess that Yahweh will be their God forever and ever (*'ôlām wā'ed,* Ps. 48:15[14]). Since Yahweh guides the people of God to salvation, the righteous can say that they are like a green olive tree in the house of God, and trust in God's steadfast love forever and ever (*'ôlām wā'ed,* 52:10[8]). This also means that they will follow Yahweh's instructions forever and ever (*lᵉ'ôlām wā'ed,* 119:44). When Yahweh's eternal dominion is revealed, the wise will shine like heaven, and those who lead their people to righteousness will shine like the stars forever and ever (*lᵉ'ôlām wā'ed,* Dnl. 12:3).

c. *Construct Expressions.* In blessing the tribe of Joseph, Jacob points out that the blessings of the father are stronger than those of the eternal mountains (*harᵃrê 'ad* with LXX) and of the everlasting *('ôlām)* hills (Gen. 49:26). This image refers to the power and stability of creation, whose blessings are the foundation for prosperous life in the

promised land. A comparison between this particular blessing and the parallel tradition in the blessing of Moses in Deuteronomy, however, which speaks of the finest produce of the ancient mountains *(harᵉrê qeḏem)* and the abundance of the everlasting *('ôlām)* hills (Dt. 33:15), shows that Jacob's blessing for Joseph apparently represents the consciously transformed version of the apparently earlier parallel tradition from the blessing of Moses. The reason for the reshaping is obvious. By placing the father's blessing over those of the mountains and hills, Jacob's blessing clearly restricts the threat of a potential deification of natural phenomena; as texts from Ugarit show, mountains and hills were frequently viewed as the dwellings of the gods.[5]

In Isa. 9:5(6) the name of the messianic ruler is *'ᵃḇî-'aḏ,* which appears linguistically to be a construct combination. Because *'āḇ* can have different content, and because *'aḏ* can be understood from the perspective of two different, semantically disparate stems ("unlimited duration, eternity"; and "spoils"), scholars do not agree concerning the interpretation of the name.[6]

If one takes as a point of departure the father's status as head of the family unit, in which the *'āḇ* holds the power of command and decision for a given group, then the name *'ᵃḇî-'aḏ* means that its bearer will always, i.e., perpetually, possess the rule bestowed on him. If one focuses on the father's responsibility for the welfare of those dependent on him, then the name *'ᵃḇî-'aḏ* expresses more the ruler's concern for the welfare of his people, who expect aid from him for all eternity. Some interpreters have drawn attention to the fundamental meaning of the term "father" as "begetter, originator, creator"; if one thus understands the name of the messianic ruler such that *'ᵃḇî-'aḏ* is the creator and producer of the years in the sense of the promise to Nathan, then the figure emerges as the founder of David's eternal kingship.

These explanations, however, suffer from the excessive generality of their respective understanding of the concept "father," something complicated even further by the similarly unclear relationship to eternity. In view of this difficulty, some have suggested translating the name *'ᵃḇî-'aḏ* as "father of spoils," which is also possible in Hebrew, adducing in support the fact that the notion of the savior's eternal rule is not developed explicitly until v. 6(7), and that in v. 5(6) this notion would inappropriately interrupt the logical development discernible in the two first names, *pele' yô'ēṣ* and *'ēl gibbôr,* from plan to victory to consequences.[7] Several considerations militate against this interpretation, however. The consequences of that planning, whose essential concept is the messianic ruler, can hardly be merely the spoils of war. Furthermore, the notion of the distribution of spoils has already been addressed in v. 2(3), and even with a different term *(šālāl).*

It is worth noting, however, that Isa. 9:5(6) is referring not primarily to the savior himself but rather to Yahweh, whose rule the savior actually represents, and that in this context the word *'aḏ* refers to the consistent, irrevocable implications, from Yahweh's

---

5. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1984), 201.
6. Cf. the overview in M. Rehm, *Der königliche Messias* (Kevelaer, 1968), 156-60.
7. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. ²1983), 204, 210.

perspective, of election as manifest even in God's judgment on Israel, emphasizing God's fatherly love, love revealed in this context in the forgiveness of sins (Isa. 63:16; 64:7[8]; Hos. 11:1-9). The name *'ᵃḇî-'aḏ* can then be translated "Everlasting Father" (so also NRSV), an interpretation commensurate with the eschatology of the prophetic oracle. The meaning is then that the messianic ruler, in his very person, represents the irreversible revelation of Yahweh's status as father for the elect in all eternity.

If in Isa. 47:7 one reads *gᵉḇereṯ 'aḏ* with both *BHS* and *HAL*,[8] then the prophet here has the personified high power Babylon speak in a style resembling the kind of self-glorification found in the inscriptions of ancient oriental rulers, a style contrasting with Yahweh's revelation as the savior-God of his people Israel (Ex. 3:14): "I shall be there forever *(lᵉ'ôlām)*, mistress forever." This statement exemplifies the success-based hubris of a self-absolutizing political high power.

In Isa. 57:15 Yahweh appears in the messenger formula as "the high and lofty one who rules for eternity *(šôḵēn 'aḏ)*, whose name is Holy." This reference to Yahweh's eternal rule derives apparently from the Jerusalem tradition of God's kingship, a tradition also resonating in the call account of the prophet Isaiah (6:1-5).

The theophany portrayal in the book of Habakkuk recounts that the earth shook at Yahweh's coming, and that the nations trembled at the sight of him; indeed, the eternal mountains *(harᵉrê-'aḏ)* were shattered and the everlasting hills sank low (Hab. 3:6). The motif of the quaking earth, a constitutive element of theophany portrayals in describing nature's reaction to God's coming,[9] uses the example of the shattering of the ancient mountains (cf. Gen. 49:26 above) to emphasize God's irresistible power.

2. *Parallel Expressions.* The considerable number of parallel expressions greatly facilitates the understanding of *'aḏ*. The most important is → עולם *'ôlām*, occurring in *'aḏ-'ôlᵉmê 'aḏ* as an amplification of a prepositional combination with *'aḏ* (Isa. 45:17), in *(lᵉ)'ôlām-wā'eḏ* in emphasizing the adv. acc. *'aḏ* (Ex. 15:18; Ps. 9:6[5]; 10:16; 21:5[4]; 45:7,18[6,17]; 48:15[14]; 52:10[8]; 104:5; 119:44; 145:1,2,21; Dnl. 12:3; Mic. 4:5), and in *parallelismus membrorum* with *'aḏ* (Gen. 49:26; Ps. 92:8f.[7f.]; 111:8; 148:6; Isa. 26:4; 45:17; 47:7; Hab. 3:6). Other parallel expressions include → נצח *neṣaḥ* (Ps. 9:19[18]; Am. 1:11), *bᵉḵol-dōr wāḏōr* (Ps. 45:18[17]), *yôm yôm* (61:9[8]), *kîmê šāmāyim* (89:30[29]), *tāmîḏ* (119:44), and *bᵉḵol-yôm* (145:2). Semantically, these parallel expressions underscore the meaning of *'aḏ* as "perpetual duration" and "time without end."

3. *Theological Considerations.* The term *'aḏ*, occurring first of all with secular meaning (Prov. 12:19; Am. 1:11), acquires theological significance only within the horizon of an eschatology whose central focus is the eternally valid manifestation of Yahweh's universal kingship and, in connection with that, the appointment of a messi-

8. *HAL*, II, 787f.

9. J. Jeremias, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Gattung. WMANT* 10 (²1977), 48f.

anic mediator of salvation. This provides the backdrop for Yahweh's eschatological revelation, one emphasizing the eternal nature of its duration on Zion in the promised land (Ex. 15:18), where after a relatively brief period of wrath and judgment (Isa. 57:15; 64:8[9]; Mic. 4:5) Yahweh irrevocably grants his people eternal deliverance and salvation (Isa. 45:17) along with the corresponding living space (Ps. 37:29). In the present, adherence to the divine instructions (Ps. 119:44; Mic. 4:5) already leads toward these events, events encompassing the entirety of a creation appointed from the very outset for eternal duration (Ps. 104:5; 148:6; Isa. 65:18). A similar situation applies to the announcement of the messianic mediator of salvation, a witness for all eternity to Yahweh's fatherly love (Isa. 9:5[6]) and who in fulfillment of the promise to David (Ps. 89:30[29]; 132:12) represents a kingship borne by Yahweh's irrevocable salvific revelation (Ps. 45:7,18[6,17]). In view of Yahweh's royal dominion as manifested for all eternity, the faith of the people of God speaks of an everlasting salvation for the righteous (Dnl. 12:3), a notion developed against the backdrop of the corresponding eternal ruin of the wicked (1 Ch. 28:9; Ps. 83:18[17]; 92:8[7]).

This connection between the theological meaning of the term *'ad* and the central themes of OT eschatology is also commensurate with the form-critical observation that *'ad* occurs largely in passages characterized by a liturgical-hymnic style, a situation doubtless related to the appearance of Yahweh's universal kingship as an event provoking the acknowledgment and praise of the faithful people of God. All the same, the origins of this hymnic-liturgical style probably already extend back to the forefield of eschatological predication, i.e., to the grounding of the salvific-historical tradition at issue here. Hence the election of Zion as the seat of Yahweh's throne for all eternity (Isa. 57:15) as actualized through the transport of the ark to Jerusalem and the construction of the temple as God's dwelling place (Ps. 132:14) probably also led to the adoption of several metaphors already extant in pre-Israelite cultic poetry, e.g., the metaphor of the eternal rock (Isa. 26:4), which by all appearances is to be viewed in analogy to that of the ancient mountains and eternal hills (Gen. 49:26; Hab. 3:6). Similarly, the announcement of the messiah's eternal dominion (Ps. 45:7[6]; Isa. 9:5[6]) as well as the mention of eternal life and of the mediation of blessings for the people in connection with the Davidic king (Ps. 21:5,7[4,6]) probably derives from notions associated with ancient oriental courtly style of the sort already partly discernible in the prophecy of Nathan.

Even though "no evidence of a well-conceived theological concept of time and eternity" can be found in the passages adduced with regard to the term *'ad* in the OT, and "often only the finality and unalterability of a matter is emphasized,"[10] still in the majority of cases Israel's faith in Yahweh and the consummation of his revelation as creator and redeemer has shaped the content of *'ad* such that in the process, the biblical understanding of time and eternity has also gained considerably in theological relevance.

---

10. Jenni, *TLOT*, II, 838.

III. LXX. As a rule the LXX translates *'aḏ* with *aiṓn*. Exceptions include *eis télos* (1 Ch. 28:9), *en kairṓ* (Isa. 64:8[9]), and *apó toú éti* (Job 20:4). In 4 instances the LXX reads *'ēḏ* instead of *'aḏ*, translating *eis martýrion* (Prov. 29:14; Am. 1:11; Mic. 7:18) and *martyrían* (Prov. 12:19). The use of *'aḏ* in construct combinations usually prompted the LXX to circumscribe the expression: *oréōn monímōn* (Gen. 49:26); *egṓ gár áxō eirḗnēn epí toús árchontas* (Isa. 9:5[6]); *eis tón aiṓna ésomai árchousa* (47:7); *katoikṓn tón aiṓna* (57:15). No rendering is provided for Isa. 30:8; 65:18; Hab. 3:6.

IV. Qumran. The writings in Qumran use the noun *'aḏ* in a theological sense similar to that in the OT. One praises God's holiness, which endures from before time into all eternity *(lᵉ'ôlᵉmê 'aḏ;* 1QH 13:1,13), and in connection with the revelation of God's eternal glory also speaks of eternal joy *(śimḥaṯ 'aḏ)* and an eternal affliction *(pᵉquddaṯ 'aḏ)* of God's creation works (13:6,10). Whereas in the final judgment God will destroy the wicked forever, the righteous, i.e., those who are "in the design of his heart," will stand before God forever *(la'aḏ,* 4:21), for God himself establishes them there for all eternity *(lᵉ'ôlᵉmê 'aḏ,* 7:31). God will decimate the wicked forever *(lā'aḏ)* because he always *(lā'aḏ)* hates iniquity (14:16,25). By contrast, the elect will enjoy his steadfast love for all eternity *(lᵉ'ôlᵉmê 'aḏ,* 17:28). The blessings also emphasize that God's eternal covenant with the believing people will endure forever *(lā'aḏ,* 1QSb 1:3), and emphasize in connection with the blessing for priests that God has established the peace of the high priest for all eternity *(lᵉ'ôlᵉmê 'aḏ,* 3:21), and has transferred service to the sons of Zadok for all time *(kol-qiṣṣê 'aḏ,* 5:18). In this context *'aḏ* always appears within the horizon of eschatological statements and with reference to things and events attaching to the eschatological revelation of God's glory.

The noun *'aḏ* appears once in the Temple Scroll in reference to God's abiding with the children of Israel forever *(lᵉ'ôlām wā'eḏ,* 11QT 45:14), but then in 3 additional passages as well whose meaning in context is still rather obscure (29:8; 35:9; 46:4).

Haag

עָדָה *'āḏâ;* עֲדִי *'ᵃḏî*

Contents: I. Etymology and Occurrences. 1. Etymology and Personal Names; 2. Verb and Noun in the OT; Objects and Synonyms. II. Concrete Use. III. Israel/Jerusalem as Bride and Harlot. IV. The New Israel; the Anointed in Yahweh's Adornment. V. Arrogance as Adornment. VI. The Fullness of Life. VII. LXX and Qumran.

'āḏâ. G. Castellino, "Psalm XXXII 9," *VT* 2 (1952) 37-42; E. Feucht, "Schmuck," *LexÄg,* V (1984), 668-70; A. A. Macintosh, "A Third Root עדה in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 24 (1974) 454-73; Y. Shaviv, "עדין, עדנה, עד," *BethM* 22 (1977) 295-99, 399f.; J. A. Thompson, "Expansion of the עד Root," *JSS* 10 (1965) 222-40; H. Weippert, "Schmuck," *BRL²*, 282-89; U. Winter, *Frau und Göttin. OBO* 53 (1983), 302-12, 588-98, et passim.

I. Etymology and Occurrences.

1. *Etymology and Personal Names.* Whereas Gesenius still spoke of merely one verb *'āḏâ,*[1] scholars today generally and probably correctly assume the presence of two different roots. The term *'āḏâ* I is an expansion of *'d* and has the basic meaning "go forward" in Job 28:8 as a parallel to *hiḏrîḵ.*[2] Its meaning in the hiphil is attested in Prov. 25:20 as "take off, lay aside" (clothing).[3] This verb occurs frequently in Daniel, in the Targs., Syriac, Ethiopic, and Arabic. Its presence as a noun is suspected in Ps. 32:9.[4] The verb *'āḏâ* II has the basic meaning "adorn oneself; adorn."[5] A derivation of this is the noun *'ᵃḏî,*[6] usually meaning "ornament(s)." The derivation with regard to Ps. 32:9; 103:5; and Ezk. 16:7 (and Sir. 31:28) is disputed. A. A. Macintosh suspects the presence of a third root deriving from Arab. *ǵḏ'* with the semantic nuances "gallop," "sustenance," and "menstruation."

Peculiarly, the verb and noun never appear in the surrounding Semitic sphere with the meaning "ornament, adornment," but only as personal names; in Ugaritic, Assyrian, Neo-Punic, Edomite, and Old South Arabic,[7] the reference is often to the names of women. Hebrew PNs include *'āḏâ, 'ᵃḏāyā', 'ᵃḏî'ēl, 'ᵃḏāyâ,* and perhaps *'iddô.* From the perspective of vocations, it is of semantic interest that queens, singers (male and female) and musicians (Gen. 4:19f.,23; 1 Ch. 6:26[Eng. v. 41]), priests (1 Ch. 9:12; Neh. 11:12), and treasurers (1 Ch. 27:25) receive this name.[8] Origins extend especially into the southern Palestinian sphere (Gen. 4:19f.,23; 36:2,16; 1 Ch. 4:36; also Arad 58:1, etc.), and the majority of occurrences are postexilic.

2. *Verb and Noun in the OT; Objects and Synonyms.* The verb occurs 8 times, though only in the qal, including Jer. 4:30; Ezk. 16:11; 23:40 in paronomastic expressions with the noun *'ᵃḏî.* The noun occurs 13 times, as well as in Sir. 6:30; 31:28; 43:9. The majority of occurrences (14) are in the prophetic writings. The subject of this action of adorning is often feminine, though in 2 S. 1:24 Saul adorns Israel's daughters, and in Ezk. 16:11 Yahweh adorns Jerusalem. Occurrences in the masculine include Ex. 33:4,5,6; Job 40:10; Ps. 32:9; Ezk. 7:20; and the passages in Sirach. The noun occurs together with verbs of "putting on" and "taking off" (*šîṯ,* Ex. 33:4; *'ālâ* hiphil, 2 S. 1:24; *lāḇēš,* Isa. 49:18; *yāraḏ* hiphil, Ex. 33:5; *nāṣal* hithpael, Ex. 33:6), of "forgetting" (*šāḵaḥ,* Jer. 2:32), and of "glittering" (*śrq,* Sir. 43:9). The adornment itself consists of *zāhāḇ* (2 S. 1:24; Jer. 4:30; Sir. 6:30) and *zāhāḇ wāḵesep̱* (Ezk. 16:13); direct objects include *nezem, ḥelyâ* (Hos. 2:15), *kᵉlî* (Isa. 61:10), and *tōp̱* (Jer. 31:4).

1. *GesTh,* II, 990f.
2. Thompson, 227-29.
3. Cf. M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, "Bemerkungen zur Schlangenbeschwörung," *UF* 7 (1975) 122, 125.
4. Thompson, 227.
5. *HAL,* II, 789.
6. Concerning its construction, cf. *BLe,* 457p'.
7. Documentation in *HAL,* II, 789, 791.
8. For queens see *APN,* 12; for musicians, *KAI,* II, 136.

Synonymous objects illustrate the different types of adornment, and include bracelets, necklaces, nose rings, earrings, diadems (Ezk. 16:11f.; 23:42; Sir. 6:31), and ribbons (Jer. 2:32?). Putting on jewelry is part of beautification that also includes washing (Ezk. 16:10; 23:40), anointing (Ezk. 16:9), being clothed with fine fabrics (2 S. 1:24; Jer. 4:30; Ezk. 16:10,13), fine footwear (Ezk. 16:10), and eye makeup (Jer. 4:30; Ezk. 23:40). The purpose of all this extends from victory celebrations (2 S. 1:24) to bridal adornment (Isa. 61:10; Jer. 2:32) to coronation as queen (Ezk. 16:10ff.) to the colorful appearance of the harlot (Ezk. 23:40; Hos. 2:15[13]).[9]

The comparative particle *kᵉ* in Isa. 49:18 identifies *ʿᵃḏî* as a metaphor, as is the entire sentence in Isa. 61:10. The obj. *gāʾôn* is shared by Job 40:10 and Ezk. 7:20.

II. Concrete Use. Ex. 33:4-6 and 2 S. 1:24 use both the subject and the object in the concrete sense. In Ex. 33:4 the people take off their ornaments from Egypt (12:35f.) in a mourning ritual (similar to Nu. 14:39; Neh. 8:9), ornaments otherwise used merely for nonsense (the golden calf, Ex. 32:2f.). W. Beyerlin is probably correct in assuming the presence of a fixed custom behind this story.[10] Only dismissal of the "requisites of Egypt"[11] makes new dialogue between Moses and Yahweh possible (vv. 4,11). The sequence of *ʿᵃḏî — yāḏaʿ — ʾōhel môʿēḏ* in vv. 5-7 is probably intentional wordplay. 2 S. 1:24, in David's lament over Saul, addresses the lament of the women. Based simply on the features it shares with Jer. 4:30 *(šānî, ʿᵃḏî zāhāḇ)* and the utter absence of *šānî* in witnesses from the period of the monarchy, apart from the exaggerated style of the obituary to Saul (2 S. 1:23b), one should probably not date this notice too early.[12]

III. Israel/Jerusalem as Bride and Harlot. 1. Hos. 2:15(13) summarizes Yahweh's reckoning against his harlot wife Israel. Again and again (imperfect), Israel offered incense and sacrifices to the Baʿals (4:13; 11:2) and dressed herself like a harlot (v. 4[2]),[13] whereas it is Yahweh who provides grain, wine, and oil as well as silver and gold (v. 10[8]). Israel has forgotten her husband and provider, and has alienated herself from Yahweh by putting on such ornaments (*ḥelyâ* and *nezem,* v. 15[13]). Yahweh thus withdraws everything and delivers her naked to her lovers (v. 12[10]) as on the day of her birth, "like a wilderness" (cf. 13:5f.).

---

9. Concerning the actual adornments and religio-historical considerations, cf. Weippert, Winter, Feucht (with bibliog.), and *AuS,* V, 340-53; S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie I. Grundriss der Gesamtwissenschaft des Judentums* (repr. Hildesheim, 1966), 198-206.

10. W. Beyerlin, *Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions* (Eng. trans., Oxford, 1966), 111f.

11. E. Zenger, *Das Buch Exodus. Geistliche Schriftlesung* 7 (Düsseldorf, 1987), 237f.

12. Contra F. Stolz, *Das erste und zweite Buch Samuel. ZBK* 9 (1981), 189; P. K. McCarter, *II Samuel. AB* 9 (1984), 66-79; D. L. Zapf, "'How Are the Mighty Fallen!' A Study of 2 Samuel 1:17-27," *Grace Theological Journal* 5 (1984) 95-126; cf. W. H. Shea, "David's Lament," *BASOR* 221 (1976) 141-44.

13. Regarding such adornments as identifying features of those who belong to Baʿal, cf. Winter, 595.

2. Jer. 2:32 picks up on the image of Israel's bridal period (v. 2) in the wilderness. A *bᵉṯûlâ* (Israel) cannot possibly forget her ornaments, or a bride her attire (cf. 13:11). Yet just as grievously as in Hos. 2:15(13), the people have forgotten Yahweh, and her lovers are now foreign powers (Jer. 2:33-36) for whom the daughter Zion makes herself beautiful (4:30; as does Jezebel in 2 K. 9:30). But this radiance is followed by the cry of the naked woman, the woman in labor, who gives birth to trash (Jer. 4:31). Instead of standing there beautiful *(yph)*, she now gasps for her final breath *(yph)* and stretches out her hands against those who are at her throat *(nep̱eš)*.

3. Ezk. 16:11 tells of the foundling Jerusalem and of how Yahweh provided for all her vital necessities (cf. the image in Hos. 2:10f.[8f.]), of the fine clothing and glittering jewelry she puts on as Yahweh's bride. Yahweh adorns her, and she "grew exceedingly beautiful, fit to be a queen." Vv. 15-19, however (note the reversal of Yahweh's gifts: clothing, jewelry, food), reveal the bride who has become presumptuous in her beauty, giving herself to every passerby. The adulteress is punished as in Hos. 2 through being made naked before her lovers, stripped of her beautiful objects, then stoned to death and cut to pieces with swords, her houses burned.

The difficult passage Ezk. 16:7 *(wattāḇō'î baʿᵃḏî ʿᵃḏāyîm)* is given widely varying renderings. The LXX has *eis póleis póleōn*, the Vulg. *ad mundum muliebrem*, similarly also W. Zimmerli using *'iddîm* (Isa. 64:5[6]).[14] In my opinion, however, there is no need to depart from an intensification of the root *'dh* II, *"ornatus."* The word choice parallels v. 8 with *wā'āḇô' biḇᵉrîṯ*, and one may also note the parallelism with the twofold *ḥay*, as well as the triad series *tirbî — tigdᵉlî — tāḇō'î*. The focus is less on corporeal maturity (v. 7b) than on the fullness of life (v. 7a), juxtaposed then with marriage and kingship.[15] Ps. 103:5 and Sir. 31:28 also approximate this meaning.

Ezk. 23:36-49, in the section where Ohola/Oholiba adorns herself, is in part textually difficult and dependent on Jer. 4:30f. and Ezk. 16:11-14. Additional motifs recall Prov. 7:15ff.; 9:2; Isa. 56:12; 57:3; Hos. 4:18. In Ezk. 23:48f. the image functions as an admonition for potential adulteresses.

IV. The New Israel; the Anointed in Yahweh's Adornment. 1. The image of the wilderness and of Yahweh's marital love in Jer. 31:2-6 recalls Hos. 9:10; 13:5; and especially Jer. 2:2f. The wilderness, however, is not only a symbol of Yahweh's abiding loyalty (perfect), but at the same time a reminder of present distress (*śᵉrîḏê ḥāreḇ;* cf. 30:12-15), the lovers who have forgotten Israel (30:14), the wilderness of the promised land (4:11,26; 9:1,11[2,12]; 22:6; 33:10,12). But something new is coming, something resembling the old (3 times *'ôḏ*). Yahweh himself will build up the *bᵉṯûlâ* (paronomasia; cf. 24:6; 31:28; 33:7; 42:10). Here, however, the virgin is less the adorned bride[16] than the herald of deliverance through Yahweh similar to that in Ex. 15:20 (cf. Jer. 30:19; 31:7).

---

14. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 324; concerning the history of exegesis, cf. Macintosh, 460-63, 469-71.

15. Cf. M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20. AB* 22 (1983), 276-79.

16. Contra J. A. Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah. NICOT* (1979), 567.

2. Isa. 49:14-23 uses the image of the adorned bride (v. 18) for Zion, who puts on her sons from the Diaspora like an ornament.[17] Again it is Yahweh himself from whom all events are to proceed. This is like a new bridal status for Zion, whom Yahweh seemed to have forsaken (vv. 14f., not just the forgetting of the mother),[18] and who had been robbed of her children (cf. 2 S. 17:8; Hos. 13:8), driven out (*glh,* Isa. 49:9), the "bastard" (Jer. 2:21). She is promised the bridal ornaments of life, of children, of the spaciousness of the world (cf. Isa. 52:9; 54:1) that the kings of the nations (49:22f.) will bring to her.

3. Isa. 61:9f. speaks of the person gifted with the "spirit," the anointed, the herald of Yahweh's glory and of joy with Zion (vv. 1-3). In the image of the bridegroom and bride, he is the symbol of the people and of Yahweh in the marital bond and ornaments (62:3-5). His office is priestly (v. 6) and glorious (often *p'r,* chs. 60f.), like a bride in royal jewelry (cf. 62:3). Yahweh clothes him in garments of salvation and righteousness (cf. 62:1f.). Perhaps this adornment is also referring to the coming of the sons and daughters (cf. 61:9,11 and 62:11f.).

4. The yoke of the fear of God is a royal-priestly ornament (Sir. 6:18-37, esp. 30f.) for those who accept wisdom. This yoke brings glory (*kāḇôḏ,* 51:17,26), its bonds a portion of the priestly vestments of someone like Aaron or Simon (45:10,12; 50:11,12).

Perhaps one ought also adduce here the peculiar reading in Sir. 43:9b (Ms. B, mg.): *wʿdy mśryq kmrwmy ʾl;* the entire verse would then read: "The beauty and glory of heaven is the star [LXX: stars]; [its] ornament [var.: 'its light'] glitters like the [var.: 'in the'] heights of God." The terms *kôḵāḇ* (cf. CD 7:18f.) and *maśrîq* also occur in Sir. 50:6f. in reference to the high priest Simon; is he also meant here? The LXX smooths the text over.

V. Arrogance as Adornment. In the following passages, the term becomes increasingly abstract.

1. In Ezk. 7:20 (secondary)[19] the expression *ṣᵉḇî ʿeḏyô* probably refers first to silver and gold (v. 19), and then perhaps to the entire country (cf. 20:6,15) and its goods. The country has misused its ornaments for arrogant ends, for idols (cf. 16:17), and Yahweh now puts an end to this (7:24; 33:28 *šbt*); the reference here is probably not primarily to the temple.[20]

2. Job 40:1-14 is probably a unified text.[21] Yahweh challenges Job to a dispute. Yahweh's *gāʾôn,* an expression of his thundering power (37:4f.) and of his kingship

---

17. Cf. R. P. Merendino, "Jes 49,14-26: Jahwes Bekenntnis zu Sion und die neue Heilszeit," *RB* 89 (1982) 321-69.
18. Contra Merendino, 327-29.
19. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 211f.
20. Contra Fuhs, *Ezechiel 1–24. NEB* VII (1984), 47f.
21. V. Kubina, *Die Gottesreden im Buche Hiob. FThS* 115 (1979), 120-23.

(Ps. 93:1), counters the overweening pride of evil (Job 40:11f.; 33:17; 22:29). Yahweh is "high in the heavens" (*gbh,* 22:12). Job is merely to deck himself with Yahweh's majesty and splendor (40:10; cf. 37:21f.)! In that case, however, he is also to carry out Yahweh's office of anger against the wicked and the proud (40:11ff.; 20:23,28; 21:17).

3. In Ps. 32:9 the term *'eḏyô* is difficult to understand, as reflected in the plethora of readings and interpretations. The LXX has *tás siagónas,* "cheek," similarly also the Vulg. with *camus,* "muzzle." The Targs. have *tyqwn',* *"ornatus eorum."* Macintosh and P. C. Craigie have "gallop" after Arab. *ġadā.*[22] G. Castellino has *'da* I, "approached," while H.-J. Kraus emends as *'uzzô,* and S. Mowinckel reads *'ᵃḏî* in the sense of "passion, wildness, vitality."[23] It seems appropriate to maintain *'ᵃḏî* in the negative sense of "arrogance, pride," referring to the wicked over against the believer (v. 2; cf. also the parallel in vv. 8f.). The metaphor may refer to the wicked in their blind, prideful wildness (cf. the animal metaphor in 2 K. 19:28), their adornment, which is like that of a stallion; it may also refer to fools (Prov. 26:3), who in their defiance of Yahweh constantly bring suffering on themselves *(k'b).*[24]

VI. The Fullness of Life. 1. In Ps. 103:5 the term *'eḏyēḵ* has also prompted many different interpretations.[25] The LXX translates as *epithymía,* similarly also Vulg.; Targ. has *ywmy sybwtyyky,* "days of your old age," perhaps in connection with *'aḏ,* "lasting, enduring." Macintosh, among others, translates as "sustenance."[26] In this passage *'ᵃḏî* parallels on the one hand *ḥayyāyᵉḵî* (v. 4), and then the image of the eagle renewing its youth (v. 5b; cf. Isa. 40:31). Finally, it is also interpreted through the verb of adorning (cf. Ps. 8:6[5]; 65:12[11]).[27] Based on the understanding of the notion of Yahweh "satisfying" (81:17[16]; 91:16; 105:40; 107:9; 132:15; 145:16; 147:14), *ṭôḇ* refers less to beauty than to the fullness of something precious or dear. This suggests (cf. the feminine) a faint connection with Hos. 2 and Ezk. 16:7. Yahweh satisfies "what is most valuable" to human beings — their very lives — with fullness (wealth?).

2. This complex also includes Sir. 31:28. Wine, drunk in moderation, results in *śmḥt lb,* a "rejoicing of heart," *śśwn,* "gladness," and *'dwy;* drunk in excess, it leads to *k'b r'š,* a "headache," *l'nh,* "bitterness," and *qlwn,* "quarrels" (*qlwn* contrasts not with *śśwn* but with *'dwy;* cf. 3:10 and 5:13 concerning *kbwd*).[28] Enjoyed in the proper way, wine does not yield quarrels but joy, an adornment of the heart, and life (*ḥayyîm,* v. 27). Its company is not despising and reproach (v. 31), and its jewelry is a "divine" song (32:5)!

---

22. Macintosh, 468; Craigie, *Psalms 1–50. WBC* 19 (1983), 265.
23. Castellino, 41; Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), in loc.; Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien,* 2 vols. (repr. Amsterdam, 1961), I, 52f.
24. → כסל *ksl* (VII, 264-69); → VII, 11.
25. Cf. *BHS; HAL,* II, 791.
26. P. 469.
27. → עטר *'āṭar.*
28. Cf. Macintosh, 471ff.

VII. LXX and Qumran. 1. The LXX usually renders the verb *'dh* II with *kosméō, katakosméō,* and then in the extended sense as *peritíthēmi* (Hos. 2:15) and *(ana)lambánō* (Jer. 31:4; Job 40:10). The noun is usually rendered as *kósmos* (14 times), probably to be understood as "adornment, ornament."[29] With the meaning "splendid garments," the rendering is *peristolḗ* (Ex. 33:6) and *stolaí tṓn doxṓn* (33:5), and with the meaning "mourning garment" as *penthikoí* (33:4). The LXX also uses interpretive paraphrases, e.g., *póleis póleōn* (Ezk. 16:7), *tás siagónas* (Ps. 31:9 [MT 32:9]), and *epithymía* (Ps. 102:5). Sir. 31:28 has *psychḗ;* Sir. 43:9 translates with *kósmos phōtízōn;* the expression *stolḗ dóxēs* connects Ex. 33:5 with Sir. 6:29,31.[30]

2. In Qumran the word appears in the War Scroll (1QM 12:15 = 19:7), in allusions to Isa. 60–62, and in the passage regarding the ornaments recalling Isa. 49:18. The image of the sons coming from the Diaspora is admittedly not included, and the daughters (?) of Jerusalem are called to rule over the kingdom of the nations. Otherwise, the term *'ᵃḏî* also appears in a liturgical prayer (1Q34bis fr. 3, 1:4) in reference to the adornment of heaven (cf. Sir. 43:9), and in 4Q148 1:5, probably in an interpretation of Prov. 5 in reference to the harlot's adornment.

Madl

---

29. Cf. H. Sasse, "κοσμέω, κόσμος, κτλ.," *TDNT,* III, 880, 887.
30. Cf. W. Wilckens, "στολή," *TDNT,* VII, 688f.

עֵדָה *'ēḏâ*

Contents: I. Etymology, Occurrences, LXX. II. Definitions: 1. General Assembly or Congregation; 2. "Primitive Democracy"; 3. Men Fit for Military Service; 4. Legal Function; 5. Ritual Function; 6. Organization; 7. Scope; 8. Figurative Use: *'ᵃḏaṯ-'ēl;* 9. Crowds of Animals. III. Special Meanings. IV. Summary. V. Qumran.

'ēḏâ. G. W. Anderson, "Israel: Amphictyony: *'am; ḳāhāl; 'ēḏâh," Translating and Understanding the OT. FS H. G. May,* ed. H. T. Frank and W. L. Reed (Nashville, 1970), 135-51; J. M. Casciaro, "El concepto de 'Ekklesia' en el AT," *EstBíb* 25 (1966) 317-48; 26 (1967) 4-38; G. Evans, "Ancient Mesopotamian Assemblies," *JAOS* 78 (1958) 1-11, 114f.; Z. Falk, "'Those Excluded from the Congregation,'" *BethM* 20/3 [62] (1974/75) 342-51, 432, esp. 346; R. Gordis, "Democratic Origins in Ancient Israel: The Biblical *'êdāh," A. Marx Jubilee Volume,* English Section (New York, 1949), 369-88; J. M. Grintz, "The Treaty of Joshua with the Gibeonites," *JAOS* 86 (1966) 113-26; idem, "Early Terms in the Priestly Torah," *Leš* 40 (1976/77) 18f.; H. G. Güterbock, *Authority and Law in the Hittite Kingdom. JAOS Sup* 17 (1954) 16-24, esp. 18f.; H. W. Hertzberg,

1. Etymology, Occurrences, LXX. The noun *ʿēḏâ* derives from the verbal root → יעד *yʿd,* "appoint," niphal "assemble, meet." This verbal root formed nouns quite early, e.g., Ugar. *ʿdt* and *mʿd* in reference to the "assembly (of the gods)."[1] It is precisely the nominal formative *ʿēḏâ* that is so widespread.[2] Since M. Görg has already delineated the etymology elsewhere,[3] I will merely add a few witnesses here, particularly from Elephantine. One document reads: "Tomorrow or the next day Anani shall rise *bʿdh* and say. . . ."[4] The term *ʿdh* occurs several times in identical divorce clauses of marriage contracts.[5] A. Cowley translates "in the congregation," interpreting the term thus as a borrowing from the Hebrew, while E. G. Kraeling views it as a prepositional phrase meaning "on her account."[6]

The LXX usually translates *ʿēḏâ* as *synagōgḗ,* though in isolated instances also with *parembolḗ,* "military camp," *episýstasis,* "tumultuous gathering," and *boulḗ,* "council." This shows that by the time of the LXX the term had already lost considerable ecclesiological significance. The rabbis narrowed the definition even further by understanding *ʿēḏâ* as referring only to the local assembly in the synagogue, while the congregation in its entirety was now known as the *keništāʾ*.[7]

Werdende Kirche im AT. Theologische Existenz heute, N.F. 20 (1950); A. Hurvitz, "Linguistic Observations on the Priestly Term *ʿēdāh* and the Language of P," *Immanuel* 1 (1972) 21-23; cf. idem, "Linguistic Observations on the Biblical Usage of the Priestly Term *ʿēdāh,*" *Tarbiz* 40 (1971) 261-67 (Heb.); T. Jacobsen, "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia," *JNES* 2 (1943) 159-72; Y. Kaufmann, *Joshua* (Jerusalem, 1966), esp. 265f.; P. Korngruen, "עדות ועדה," *Sefer E. Urbach* (Jerusalem, 1955), 19-26; S. N. Kramer, "'Vox Populi' and the Sumerian Literary Documents," *RA* 58 (1964) 149-56; J. D. W. Kritzinger, *Qehal Jahwe* (Kampen, 1957); J. Liver, "עדה," *EMiqr,* VI, 83-89; S. Loewenstamm, "עדת על," *EMiqr,* VI, 96-98; J. Milgrom, "Priestly Terminology and the Political and Social Structure of Pre-Monarchic Israel," *JQR* 69 (1979) 65-81; L. Rost, *Die Vorstufen von Kirche und Synagoge im AT. BWANT* IV/24 (1938; ²1967); J. M. Shaw, "The Concept of 'The People of God' in Recent Biblical Research" (diss., Princeton, 1958); F. J. Stendebach, "Versammlung. Gemeinde. Volk Gottes. Alttestamentliche Vorstufen von Kirche?" *Jud* 40 (1984) 211-24; J. A. Wilson, "The Assembly of a Phoenician City," *JNES* 4 (1945) 245; C. U. Wolf, "Traces of Primitive Democracy in Ancient Israel," *JNES* 6 (1947) 98-108; W. P. Wood, "The Congregation of Yahweh: A Study of the Theology and Purpose of the Priestly Document" (diss., Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., 1974).

On V: H. J. Fabry, *Studien zur Ekklesiologie des AT und der Qumrangemeinde* (diss. Habil., Bonn, 1979), esp. 200-212; L. E. Frizzell, "The People of God: A Study of the Relevant Concepts in the Qumran Scrolls" (diss., Oxford, 1974), esp. 223-26; E. Koffmahn, "Die Selbstbezeichnungen der Gemeinde von Qumran auf dem Hintergrund des AT" (diss., Vienna, 1959), esp. 150-58; J. Maier, "Zum Gottesvolk- und Gemeinschaftsbegriff in den Schriften vom Toten Meer" (diss., Vienna, 1958); C. Ramirez, "El vocabularia técnico de Qumran," *Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas* (Madrid, 1971).

1. *WUS,* no. 1195; *UT,* no. 1816.
2. JM, §75m.
3. VI, 135f.
4. *BMAP,* 2:7.
5. *BMAP,* 7:21; *AP,* 15:22, 26.
6. For further discussion see R. Yaron, "Aramaic Marriage Contracts from Elephantine," *JSS* 3 (1958) 1-39, esp. 14ff.
7. Cf. Fabry, 203; Dahl, 66f.

The term *'ēdâ* occurs in its various forms altogether 149 times in the OT, of which 129 are concentrated in the Hexateuch, here again almost exclusively in the Priestly document and writings dependent on it. It occurs not at all in Deuteronomy, and apart from Joshua only 7 times in the Deuteronomistic history (the last passage being 1 K. 12:20, in reference to the "assembly" of the renegade northern tribes; 2 Ch. 5:6 is a citation from 1 K. 8:5). The term *'ēdâ* occurs an additional 3 times in the Prophets (Jeremiah, Hosea) and 13 times in the Writings (10 times in Psalms).

The meaning of the noun is concentrated in two areas: (1) a general assembly; the popular, legal, and cultic community or congregation; (2) a swarm of animals, in a derogatory way also with reference to people in the sense of "mob, throng, gang."[8]

II. Definitions.

1. *General Assembly or Congregation.* Nu. 1:2f. explicitly defines the *'ēdâ:* "Take a census of the whole *'ēdâ* of Israelites, in their clans, by ancestral houses, according to the number of names, every male individually; from twenty years old and upward, everyone in Israel able to go to war" (cf. also the census in Nu. 26). According to v. 46, the result of the census was 603,550, excluding the Levites, who were not subject to military service. With this one exception, the *'ēdâ* thus includes every adult male with no distinctions made between class or wealth. According to Ex. 12:43-48, the *'ēdâ* includes every native *('ezrāḥ),* possibly also circumcised *gērîm.* At least one of its functions is military in nature. Jgs. 20–21 refers to the tribal army as the *'ēdâ* (20:1; 21:10,13,16), contra Rost, who maintains that the *'ēdâ* was not military in nature. In 1 K. 12:20 the *'ēdâ* has the power to crown Jeroboam I as king, and although nowhere does the *'ēdâ* actually participate in deposing a ruler, Nu. 14:1-4 may be implying such. When the *'ēdâ* hears the report of the spies, it begins to complain about Moses and Aaron, saying, "Let us choose a captain, and go back to Egypt" (v. 4). Although Moses is not a king, and although the *'ēdâ* does not carry out this threat, it is clearly aware that its leader is to serve the *'ēdâ* according to his own discretion and can certainly be deposed or replaced. This level of power suggests that the institution was already quite old, dating from before the monarchy. Accordingly, the *'ēdâ* is the "general assembly, congregation," of all free adult men and is empowered with making decisions affecting the entire nation.

2. *"Primitive Democracy."* An analogy from Mesopotamia, *puḫrum,* has long been known.[9] T. Jacobsen was the first to describe the *puḫrum* in detail, calling it an example of "primitive democracy." This Mesopotamian assembly existed alongside the Old Babylonian institution of kingship. Jacobsen believes it unlikely that such an institution could arise under a strong central power, and the kingship acquired more power precisely during this period. Hence the *puḫrum* must have roots that are considerably older. Jacobsen's studies initiated a search for similar institutions in the an-

8. *HAL,* II, 790.
9. See Wolf and Gordis.

cient Orient, the result being the identification of the Sum. *unkin* and Akk. *puḫrum* with the Hitt. *pankuš,* Phoen. (Byblos) *mōʿēd,* Ugar. *mʿd* and *pḫr,* and the Roman *comitia centuriata.*[10]

Jacobsen's argument also applies to the *ʿēdâ.* In the southern kingdom the monarchy grew and consolidated its power beginning with the Davidic period. This left little room for the *ʿēdâ,* and after the Solomonic period it is no longer mentioned in connection with the Jerusalem kingship. In 1 K. 8:5 (par. 2 Ch. 5:6) Solomon calls the *ʿēdâ* as a witness to the transfer of the ark into the new temple. Jeroboam's coronation (1 K. 12:20) shows that the concept of the *ʿēdâ* was still alive in the northern kingdom after Solomon's death.[11] Here too, however, the expanding monarchy and aristocracy weakened the *ʿēdâ,* perhaps permanently. It is inconceivable that the idea of the *ʿēdâ* arose during this period, and its existence during the monarchy excludes the possibility that it actually arose in a later period, e.g., during the postexilic period. The *ʿēdâ* must be an ancient institution that is doubtless to be dated before the monarchy and perhaps even before the conquest of Canaan.

These findings have important consequences for the relative dating of the Priestly document. As mentioned above, the word *ʿēdâ* occurs most frequently in the Hexateuch, primarily in materials from P and not at all in Deuteronomy. Until recently, the consensus held that the *ʿēdâ* was introduced only by a postexilic Priestly writing,[12] and the presence of *ʿēdâ* was a clear indication of late authorship or redaction. A. Hurvitz and J. Milgrom have shown, however, that P uses the term *ʿēdâ* commensurate with the usage of early history, and Milgrom cites evidence suggesting that later texts (Ezra, Nehemiah) routinely use *qāhāl* instead of the Priestly *terminus technicus ʿēdâ.* Although P does indeed use the term *qāhāl,* it does not do so with the technical sense of *ʿēdâ,* referring rather to an assembly in general. Thus can P speak of the *qᵉhal ʿᵃdaṯ yiśrāʾēl,* "the whole assembled congregation of Israel" or "all the assembly of the congregation of the Israelites" (Ex. 12:6; Nu. 14:5). Only quite late, as in Deuteronomy, does the term *qāhāl* acquire technical meaning (e.g., in Dt. 31:30), something especially noticeable in Ezra and Nehemiah (cf. Ezr. 10:12; Neh. 8:12).

3. *Men Fit for Military Service.* What powers did the *ʿēdâ* have? It could appoint and dismiss leaders, as already mentioned. It could also wage war and make military decisions. Nu. 32:4 mentions Gilead as "the land that Yahweh subdues for *(lipnê)* the *ʿēdâ* of Israel." In Josh. 22:12,16, the *ʿēdâ* threatens war against the tribes beyond the Jordan if they erect an altar outside Canaan. In Josh. 9:18f. the *ʿēdâ* plans to wage war against the Gibeonites even though their leaders *(nᵉśîʾîm)* made a peace treaty with them. Here, however, one also sees the limitation of the military power exercised by the *ʿēdâ,* since the oath of the *nᵉśîʾîm* also binds the entire *ʿēdâ.*

10. See, respectively, Evans and Kramer; Güterbock, 18f.; Wilson; J. A. Soggin, *Das Königtum in Israel. BZAW* 104 (1967), esp. 136-47; Korngruen.

11. Cf. in this regard A. Malamat, "Kingship and Council in Israel and Sumer: A Parallel," *JNES* 22 (1963) 247-53.

12. See Rost.

In one special instance, the war against the Midianites (Nu. 31), the *'ēḏâ* does not go to war in its entirety, sending rather only one division *(ṣāḇā')* drawn from the various tribes (vv. 3-5). When these warriors return with the spoils, the latter are divided into two equal parts; one half goes to those who participated in the war, and the other half to the rest of the *'ēḏâ* (vv. 27,43). This makes sense only if in normal situations the entire *'ēḏâ* went to war and naturally also received all the spoils.

4. *Legal Function.* The assembly also had a legal function, and in Mesopotamia this seems to have been the most important task of the *puḫrum,* at least in the Old Babylonian period.[13] In Lev. 24:10-16 the *'ēḏâ* is responsible for stoning to death the blasphemer after God has announced the sentence. In Nu. 15:32-36 the man who transgressed against the sabbath is brought before Moses, Aaron, and the *'ēḏâ* to be judged. God imposes the sentence, and the *'ēḏâ* carries it out. Even if it is God who actually passes judgment, the understanding is that the *'ēḏâ* possesses juridical authority. Only in extremely difficult cases is God actually asked for counsel. A similar situation obtains in Nu. 27:2, where the daughters of Zelophehad come to Moses, Eleazar, the *n^eśî'îm,* and the entire *'ēḏâ* to obtain a ruling. The case is again too difficult, and God rather than the *'ēḏâ* passes judgment. The Reubenites and Gadites (Nu. 32:2) bring their petition before Moses, Eleazar, and the *n^eśî'îm.* Rather than consulting the entire *'ēḏâ,* they consult only its leaders. The final example comes from P and concerns the law of cities of asylum (Nu. 35:9-28; Josh. 20:1-9). Here the text is unequivocal. The slayer in search of refuge must appear before the *'ēḏâ* (Nu. 35:12,24f.; Josh. 20:6,9), which decides whether that person may remain in the city of asylum or is to be delivered over to the blood avenger. This particular instance is especially important because it is the only law explicitly empowering the *'ēḏâ* to pass judgment. By contrast, Deuteronomy presupposes that such judgment takes place in the city of asylum, and that the asylum seeker, if found guilty, is to be turned over to the city elders, who in their own turn deliver him to the blood avenger (Dt. 19:12).

Outside P, few texts involving the *'ēḏâ* say anything about the assembly's legal function. Ps. 1:5 insists that "the wicked will not stand in the judgment, nor sinners in the *'ēḏâ* of the righteous" (concerning this interpretation of *mišpāṭ,* cf. Dt. 25:1 and Eccl. 3:16, both of which may allude to this psalm). The term *'ēḏâ* appears here in a legal context recalling texts from Elephantine, where the deceived spouse rises in the *'ēḏâ* to present his or her divorce petition (see above).

Closely related to its juridical and military power, the *'ēḏâ* also serves as an authority alongside the leaders Moses or Joshua. In Nu. 25:6f. the *'ēḏâ* stands with Moses outside the tent of meeting weeping at the deeds of Zimri and the Midianite woman in Baal of Peor. In the Midianite war of Nu. 31, the returning division presents the spoils to Moses, Eleazar, and the *'ēḏâ.* The leaders of the *'ēḏâ* together with Moses and the high priest greet the division outside the camp. In Josh. 18:1 the *'ēḏâ* assembles in

---

13. See Jacobsen.

Shiloh to apportion the land among the tribes that had not yet received their portion. Joshua announces what will happen, and the *'ēḏâ* carries it out.

In the account of the spies in Nu. 13–14, the *'ēḏâ* plays a prominent role. The spies deliver their account to Moses, Aaron, and the *'ēḏâ* (13:26). In 14:1-10 the *'ēḏâ* rebels and tries (unsuccessfully) to assert its authority against Moses and Aaron.

It is interesting to note how Deuteronomy presents the account of the spies. Although Deuteronomy never uses the expression *'ēḏâ,* it is familiar with what is meant. The account of the rebellion in Dt. 1:22-40 differs markedly from that in Numbers (e.g., the people decide to send out spies, not God), even though it is clearly based on the narrative of Numbers (Dt. 1:39 is incomprehensible without reference to Nu. 14:3). In Dt. 1:35 God swears that "this evil generation" *(dôr)* will die in the wilderness, rendering thus the expression "this wicked *'ēḏâ*" from Nu. 14:35. According to Dt. 2:14, "this generation" consists explicitly of the "warriors, men capable of bearing arms"; this is precisely the composition of the *'ēḏâ* — all men capable of bearing arms. Here the word *dôr* possibly refers to more than merely "generation." In Ugaritic, *dr* parallels *(m)pḫr(t),*[14] which we encountered above in the same semantic sphere as *'ēḏâ.* Thus although Deuteronomy was apparently well acquainted with the concept of the *'ēḏâ,* it does not use this particular expression. Why? If when Deuteronomy was composed the *'ēḏâ* no longer represented a functioning institution, then the expression *'ēḏâ* itself would sound archaic. Hence Deuteronomy paraphrases the expression, e.g., with "men capable of bearing arms," or uses a synonym such as *dôr* or *qāhāl.*[15]

5. *Ritual Function.* The *'ēḏâ* has an important function as the witness to significant events. In Lev. 8:3-5 the *'ēḏâ* assembles for the rites of priestly ordination. Although it does not participate actively in the rituals, its presence lends legitimacy to the proceedings. In Lev. 9:5 the *'ēḏâ* approaches the tent of meeting on the eighth day of inauguration but still plays no active role. Since the priests function in the name of the people, it is logical that the official assembly of the people must be present to authorize the ordination.

A similar situation obtains in Nu. 8:9-20, where the *'ēḏâ* is present at the cleansing of the Levites, though in this instance it plays a more active role. In v. 10 the Israelites (or their representatives) lay their hands on the Levites. The laying on of both hands transfers authority from one person to another (27:23).[16] Although not explicitly stated here, this probably involves such laying on of hands. The Levites are to function in the name of the *'ēḏâ,* and the *'ēḏâ* thus confirms and authorizes the Levites through the laying on of hands.

The *'ēḏâ* is twice summoned to witness the transfer of power and authority. In Nu. 20:27-29 the *'ēḏâ* attests Aaron's death and the transfer of his high-priestly office to Eleazar. In 27:19-22 the transfer of Moses' office to Joshua takes place before the *'ēḏâ.*

---

14. *KTU,* 1.40, 17.
15. Cf. Milgrom.
16. → יד *yāḏ* (V, 393-426); → סמך *sāmaḵ.*

Both situations involve the laying on of hands, and in both instances the results substantively affect the interests of the *'ēdâ*.

Verse 21 seems to differentiate between the "Israelites" and the "congregation," a distinction that might conceivably be differentiating between the people at large, including women and children, and the assembly of adult males. Another possibility is to understand the *'ēdâ* as an abbreviation for the leaders of the congregation, who then stand over against the assembly as a whole, i.e., the "Israelites." An additional explanation, one reflected in newer translations, assumes the presence of explicative *waw*. In that case the *'ēdâ* is synonymous with *bᵉnê yiśrā'ēl* as in Nu. 8 (see above). This seems the most likely explanation, since none of the other postulated distinctions occurs again in what follows.

The *'ēdâ* is summoned for the last time in this capacity at the dedication of the Solomonic temple (1 K. 8:5; 2 Ch. 5:6), where the ark of the covenant is transferred into the temple itself. The leaders of the *'ēdâ*, i.e., the elders, the heads of the tribes, and the leaders of the ancestral houses (vv. 1,3) accompany the ark from the city of David, while Solomon and the *'ēdâ* offer sacrifices. Here, too, the event to be witnessed is one of substantive interest to the whole people.

6. *Organization.* How is the *'ēdâ* organized? In Nu. 1 Moses chooses twelve men, one from each tribe, to help with the census. V. 16 refers to these men as those "chosen from the *'ēdâ*, leaders *(nᵉśî'îm)* of their ancestral tribes, the heads of the divisions of Israel *(rā'šê 'alpê yiśrā'ēl).*" The word for "tribe" here is → מטה *maṭṭeh,* which Milgrom has shown to be an extremely early expression and here is juxtaposed with *'ēdâ*. The term *'elep* is a *terminus technicus* in P corresponding to *bêṯ 'āḇôṯ;* in other sources it is juxtaposed with *mišpāḥâ* (*mišpāḥâ* is not a precise *terminus technicus* in P).[17] This section seems to imply that the tribal leaders *(nᵉśî'îm)* and the heads of the divisions *(rā'šîm)* are the same. Perhaps the two designations refer in succession to their functions outside and inside the tribes. Thus it seems that the *'ēdâ* has twelve heads called *nᵉśî'îm,* "leaders," or *qᵉrî'îm,* "those who are called or chosen."

The expression *ziqnê hā'ēdâ* occurs twice (Lev. 4:15; Jgs. 21:16). It has been interpreted as a group distinct from the *nᵉśî'îm,* though no consensus has been reached regarding who the *zᵉqēnîm* are.[18] Some think they are equivalent to the *ziqnê yiśrā'ēl* or of the seventy elders of Nu. 11. R. Gordis describes them as *primi inter pares* without any official function. J. Liver views them as heads of the clans, while C. U. Wolf tries to show that the term *zᵉqēnîm* is another designation for the members of the *'ēdâ,* and in Ex. 19:7f. and Josh. 24:1f. corresponds to the entire people. Whatever the *zᵉqēnîm* may be, nothing indicates that the *ziqnê hā'ēdâ* is anything other than a synonym for the *nᵉśî'îm.*

Nu. 1:44-47 seems quite clear in organizing the *'ēdâ* primarily according to tribes *(maṭṭeh)* and secondarily according to clans *(bêṯ 'āḇôṯ).* The question remains whether

17. Cf. Milgrom.
18. See Liver, Wolf, Gordis; → זקן *zāqēn* (IV, 122-31).

the leaders of the individual clans have any official position in the *'ēḏâ;* they are not necessarily reckoned among the *n^e^śî'îm*. Josh. 22:30 presents an interesting case. Here the clan heads seem to stand in court next to the tribal leaders. But they are not necessarily different, since the *waw* might be explicative so that the situation corresponds to that of Nu. 1:16.

One important task of the tribal leaders is to represent the *'ēḏâ* where the presence of its full membership is either impossible or unnecessary. In Ex. 16:22 the *n^e^śî'îm* tell Moses that the people have gathered twice as much manna on the day before the sabbath. The second time Moses descends from Sinai, the people are afraid to get close to him. When Moses calls them, however, Aaron and the tribal leaders go to meet him (34:31). Tribal leaders precede the *'ēḏâ,* setting a good example. When the entire congregation is to present a sin offering, the elders *(z^e^qēnîm)* of the congregation lay their hands on the sacrifice, indicating that the animal is being offered on behalf of the *'ēḏâ* (Lev. 4:15). Because it would be impossible in a practical sense for every individual Israelite to lay his or her hand on the bull, the elders as representatives of the people assume this task. Finally, when the army returns from the Midianite war (Nu. 31:13), Moses, Eleazar, and the tribal leaders leave the camp to go out and meet them.

The *n^e^śî'îm* also function as authorized representatives of the assembly with not much less authority than Moses or, later, Joshua. As already seen, they help Moses conduct the census in Nu. 31. They also aid in inventorying the Midianite spoils (31:26) and in enrolling the Levites in Nu. 4 (v. 34). In 27:2 the tribal leaders sit in judgment of the daughters of Zelophehad, albeit separated from the *'ēḏâ*. In Josh. 9 the contract Joshua makes with the Gibeonites becomes binding only when the *n^e^śî'îm* swear the oath as well (v. 15). When the Gibeonite deception is disclosed, the *'ēḏâ* is angry with the tribal leaders, not with Joshua, presumably because it is only the oath of the *n^e^śî'îm,* given in the name of the congregation, that binds the people to the contract. Hence it is possible to view the participation of the tribal leaders as more important even than that of Joshua, at least as regards contracts. In Josh. 22:13-34 the tribal leaders along with Phinehas (and possibly also the clan heads) release the tribes beyond the Jordan from their obligation to fight for the conquest of Canaan. Joshua himself has no part in this decision, and in Nu. 32:2, as well, it is the *n^e^śî'îm* of the *'ēḏâ* who accept the petition of the Reubenites and Gadites.

7. *Scope.* The *'ēḏâ* does not always refer to the entire assembly of the tribes. Because this assembly can exhibit many different aspects, it is no surprise that the term *'ēḏâ* can frequently refer to the people as a whole without regard to age and gender (cf., e.g., Ex. 12:19). According to Ex. 12:3, the entire *'ēḏâ* is to hear the Passover regulations, and according to Nu. 19:9, the water for cleansing is to be kept for the entire *'ēḏâ* (cf. also the regulations for the sabbath and for the *t^e^rûmâ* sacrifice, Ex. 35:1,4,20).

In Ex. 16:1; 17:1; Nu. 20:1,22, the term *'ēḏâ* refers to the wilderness camp of the Israelites; here, too, the term encompasses more than the cultic congregation (cf. also Nu. 20:2,8b,11).

In several instances the *'ēḏâ* is the object of divine wrath; to protect the *'ēḏâ* from Yahweh's wrath, the Levites guard the sanctuary (Nu. 1:53). The incident in Baal of

Peor brought that wrath down on the *'ēḏâ* (Nu. 31:16; Josh. 22:17f.); similarly also the actions of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10:6). During the rebellion of Korah (Nu. 16:22,24,26), Moses petitions God not to destroy the congregation because of only a few, and he admonishes the *'ēḏâ* to separate themselves from Korah. Finally, God chastises the *'ēḏâ* because of Achan's transgression (Josh. 22:20).

In Lev. 19:2 God pronounces the *'ēḏâ* holy by virtue of its relationship to him. Korah alludes to this, perhaps with a touch of irony (Nu. 16:3): "All the *'ēḏâ* are holy, every one of them. . . . So why then do you [Moses and Aaron] exalt yourselves above the entire *'ēḏâ?*" Moses reproaches the Levites for having joined Korah's rebellion (Nu. 16:9) even though they have been separated out of the *'ēḏâ* for their special service. When the congregation sins, it is often called the *'ēḏâ* (so in Lev. 4:13 and Nu. 15:24-26 for unintentional sins, or in Lev. 16:5, where it participates in the atonement of the sanctuary). Aaron's sons are to remove the sins of the *'ēḏâ* (Lev. 10:17); the *'ēḏâ* rebelled at Meribath (Nu. 27:14).

Although Jer. 30:20 is not entirely clear, within the context of the reestablishment of the people the term *'ᵃḏāṯô* seems to refer to the entire people.

In Nu. 27:16 Moses addresses God as one who respects both the individual and the congregation. Here *'ēḏâ* is used in an extremely general sense in reference to Israel. In the next verse Moses tells God that the *'ēḏâ,* the congregation of Israel, is like a flock of sheep without a shepherd. Here he calls the congregation God's *'ēḏâ.* This use appears again in Ps. 74:2, which entreats God to remember his *'ēḏâ,* which he acquired long ago. Hence the term *'ēḏâ* can refer to the entire congregation when its special relationship with God is being emphasized.

Can the expression *'ēḏâ* also refer to a subdivision smaller than the general assembly or congregation? It is indeed used to refer to Korah's rebellious followers (Nu. 16:5,6,11). It may be that the use of *'ēḏâ* here is implying that Korah has for all practical purposes formed a new people with its own *'ēḏâ.*[19] If this is the case, then the expression probably always encompasses an entire nation (cf. another explanation below). Y. Kaufmann assumes that the term *'ēḏâ* refers to the legal assembly of any individual settlement. He adduces the case of the blasphemer (Lev. 24:10-23) and that of the man who transgressed against the sabbath (Nu. 15:32-36), in which the punishment is carried out by the *'ēḏâ.* If this is realistic legislation, then the local assembly must be meant, since it would be impractical to bring all these cases before the general national assembly. The decisive qualification in this view is that P actually reproduces laws from the settlement period.[20] Priestly legislation takes as its point of departure the assumption that the life of the people is essentially unified and organized around a central sanctuary and is led by the national *'ēḏâ.* That this system was impossible to implement does not alter the fact that the *'ēḏâ* in these passages refers to the national rather than to the local assembly. P is portraying an ideal.

The laws regarding cities of refuge is possibly also understanding the *'ēḏâ* in a simi-

---

19. See Milgrom.
20. See Milgrom.

larly restricted fashion (Nu. 35 and Josh. 20). After fleeing to one of the cities of refuge, the murderer must appear before the *'ēḏâ.* Is this the national or the local assembly? If the former, then one would expect a complicated to-and-fro. That is, first the murderer flees to the city of refuge, then is brought to the location of the *'ēḏâ,* and then (if found innocent) returned to the city of refuge. The assembly would presumably have to be summoned for every individual case of negligent homicide. The second possibility is that the local assembly of the city of refuge examines the case. This would be much simpler and more practical, since a national assembly would not have to be convened. Here, too, we find that P presents less the real state of affairs than an ideal program. The assumption that the court does indeed take place before the national assembly is supported by Nu. 35:25, where the *'ēḏâ* brings the murderer to the city of refuge; this assumes that the actual trial took place elsewhere. Nonetheless, the accused is never explicitly taken outside the city for the trial; in Josh. 20:4 an initial hearing is held by the city elders. This instance remains in dispute even though it is more likely that the assembly in question is actually a general national assembly.

8. *Figurative Use: 'ᵃḏaṯ-'ēl.* Ps. 82:1 is the only passage that transfers the notion of a human legal assembly to heaven by means of the expression *'ᵃḏaṯ-'ēl.* "God has taken his place in the divine *'ēḏâ;* in the midst of the gods he holds judgment." The celestial beings thus constitute a juridical assembly that hears the legal cases of the whole world just as in P the *'ēḏâ* hears all of Israel's legal cases. God leads the heavenly *'ēḏâ* just as Moses leads the earthly one. A similar notion appears in Ugarit, where the expression *'dt ilm* appears twice, a possible equivalent of *pḫr (bn) ilm.*[21] The latter expression has its parallel in Akk. *puḫur ilāni,* "the assembly of the gods."[22] Such transference of the institution of the *'ēḏâ* to the heavenly sphere suggests an early developmental stage of these Israelite notions. The psalm refers to the members of the heavenly *'ēḏâ* as *'ᵉlōhîm,* "gods." S. Loewenstamm views them as the gods of the nations who are actually under God's control.[23] This is perhaps the original conception, one that might have been changed, through the degradation of the gods, into an *'ēḏâ* of heavenly beings all of whom are God's creations.[24]

9. *Crowds of Animals.* In Jgs. 14:8 Samson finds a swarm *('ēḏâ)* of bees in the body of the lion he had killed a short time earlier. Ps. 68:31(Eng. v. 30) reads: "Rebuke the wild animals that live among the reeds, the *'ēḏâ* of bulls with the calves of the peoples." Here *'ēḏâ* must be translated as "herd." The best translation in Ps. 22:17(16) is "mob": "For dogs are all around me; a mob of evildoers encircles me." What is the relationship between this meaning of *'ēḏâ* and that of "general assembly"? Both mean-

---

21. *KTU,* 1.15, II 7, 11; for the latter expression see 1.4, III 14; 1.47, 29.

22. *AHw,* II, 876; Jacobsen; cf. also W. H. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel. BZAW* 80 (^{2}1966), 26ff.

23. Cf. the different view of H. J. Fabry, "'Ihr alle seid Söhne des Allerhöchsten' (Ps 82,6): Kanaanäische Richter vor dem Gericht Gottes," *BiLe* 15 (1974) 135ff.

24. See V below.

ings are probably special cases of the more general meaning "group, crowd." The term *ʿēḏâ* developed in two different directions, each of which refers to a specific kind of "group."

A group of people not constituting any official institution can also be called an *ʿēḏâ,* though in this case the connotation is uniformly negative. Ps. 7:8(7) reads: "An *ʿēḏâ* of the peoples is gathered around you." This resembles the pack of dogs in 22:17(16). The peoples are viewed as animals or as a group of people behaving like animals, i.e., like rabble. Ps. 86:14 mentions an "*ʿēḏâ* of ruthless men." Such usage is not restricted to poetic contexts. Although "this wicked *ʿēḏâ*" in Nu. 14:27 and 35 refers to the assembly (see above), the connotation is that the assembly is nothing more than rebellious riffraff with whom God has lost patience. Similarly also in Nu. 17:10(16:45), where God commands Moses to "get away from this *ʿēḏâ.*" The designation *ʿēḏâ* in reference to Korah's rebels perhaps implies that Korah has founded his own separate nation with its own assembly. With respect to the meaning "rabble," however, another explanation is possible. This derogatory connotation fits Korah's group quite well, and it is almost always referred to as "Korah's *ʿēḏâ*" or "Abiram's *ʿēḏâ*" (Ps. 106:17), implying that Korah used this *ʿēḏâ* in his own interest, something quite in keeping with the actions of a demagogue. Furthermore, use of the possessive establishes a contrast between God's *ʿēḏâ* and that of Korah. God's *ʿēḏâ* is such by virtue of its special covenantal relationship with him. Although Korah does in fact refer to this relationship in justifying his own actions (Nu. 16:3), he has for all practical purposes broken that relationship and separated both himself and his rabble from the true *ʿēḏâ.* The only reference to "Abiram's *ʿēḏâ*" is interesting (Ps. 107:17). Both graphically and phonetically, it greatly resembles the herd of bulls in Ps. 68:31(30) *(ʿᵃḏaṯ ʾᵃḇîrām, ʿᵃḏaṯ ʾabbîrîm).* This verse implicitly compares Korah's rabble with a herd of bulls; both are strong but not very smart.

III. Special Meanings. Several cases remain that are difficult to classify, usually because of a lack of clarity within the corresponding passages. For example, Job 16:7 reads: "You have made desolate all my *ʿēḏâ.*" On the one hand, Job is speaking to Eliphaz, accusing him of having made his complaint worthless and meaningless. Here the term *ʿēḏâ* possibly derives from the root *ʿwd* with the meaning "attestation, witness." That is, although Job's words had to provide a witness for him, Eliphaz considered his complaint worthless and thus destroyed his case. On the other hand, this text may also refer to God, who has taken Job's entire possessions, his children as well as his animals (1:13-19). In that case a metaphorical understanding of *ʿēḏâ* would be appropriate on the basis of the frequent cases in which God's wrath consumes the entire *ʿēḏâ* (e.g., Nu. 16:22; 17:11[16:45]).

Prov. 5:14 is similarly unclear. "I was almost at the point of utter ruin in the *qāhāl* and the *ʿēḏâ.*" The young man realizes too late how foolish it was for him to fall for the strange woman *(ʾiššâ zārâ).* Although his sin probably took place in private rather in the entire congregation or assembly, he can still be viewed as someone who has publicly dishonored himself. This seems to be an unclear but fixed expression that cannot be analyzed completely without further contextual information. Whatever the case

may be, in view of the theory developed above regarding the use of *qāhāl* in texts outside P as a substitution for *'ēḏâ,* this particular expression might reflect a kind of hendiadys expressing this change.

Ps. 111:1 seems to refer to some sort of advisory committee, though the exact reference is not clear: "Praise! I will give thanks to Yahweh with my whole heart, in the *sôḏ* of the upright, in the *'ēḏâ.*" Semantically, the term *'ēḏâ* seems to approximate → סוד *sôḏ,* though the exact meaning is difficult to determine. This situation is possibly like that regarding *qāhāl wᵉ'ēḏâ* in Prov. 5:14, with *sôḏ wᵉ'ēḏâ* representing a fixed expression.

One might translate Hos. 7:12 as "I will discipline them as announced to their *'ēḏâ.*" The *'ēḏâ* was, after all, already threatened with chastisement in the wilderness because of its disobedience. This understanding is undermined, however, by the fact that *šēma' lᵉ* should mean "report *about* (something)." One should thus read with F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman: *'ēḏuṯām* (root *'wd*), "their oath, covenant," instead of *'ᵃḏāṯām,* thus "I will chastise them according to a report about their treaties."[25] This fits the context, where Israel is reprimanded for preferring to make stupid treaties with the surrounding high powers rather than to trust in God.[26]

The final obscure passage is Jer. 6:18: "Therefore hear, O nations, and know, O *'ēḏâ,* what is against them."[27] The parallelism seems to make clear that an *'ēḏâ* composed of foreign nations is being addressed, nations summoned together to witness Judah's punishment. This constitutes an expansion of the juridical and witnessing function of the *'ēḏâ.* The nations are neither judges nor sworn jury members, though they will carry out the sentence. They are present primarily as witnesses to God's judgment over Judah so that it is a public rather than a private matter.

Alternatively, *'ēḏâ* could be Israel, *'eṯ-'ᵃšer bām,* "who dwell among them [i.e., the nations]." In that case God would be addressing the nations, then Israel, and finally the entire earth (v. 19). Yet another resolution emerges if one reads *ûḏᵉ'û ḏē'â,* "Hear, O nations, and know what I will do to them." This renders unnecessary any singular expansion of *'ēḏâ* to the nations.

IV. Summary. The original meaning of *'ēḏâ* was probably "group, crowd" (cf. Job 15:34). This basic meaning was developed in two directions. First, the word was applied to various groups of animals. A simple extension led to a derogatory designation for a group of people that resembled a horde of animals. Finally, the word entered the political sphere in the use of P and in early history, where it refers specifically to the general assembly of Israelite tribes. If comparable to the Mesopotamian *puḫrum,* the *'ēḏâ* was probably an essentially democratic institution accessible to all male adults. Among other things, it was responsible for waging war, hearing legal cases, punishing certain transgressions, and attesting important events in the life of the nation. The *'ēḏâ* as a system might stem from the period of the conquest of Canaan, and it remained the

25. F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman, *Hosea. AB* 24 (1980), 471.

26. Cf. by contrast H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 107: "I will chastise them according to the report of their wickedness *(rā'āṯām).*"

27. Concerning the textual problems attaching to *ûḏᵉ'î 'ēḏâ,* cf. *BHS* and the commentaries.

leading committee of the people up to the monarchy, when under the antidemocratic pressure of the monarchy and aristocracy it collapsed. Although Deuteronomy seems still acquainted with the concept, it no longer mentions it by name, while postexilic literature completely avoids the *'ēḏâ* except when citing from older material (2 Ch. 5:6 = 1 K. 8:5). References in later literature to an Israelite assembly use the expression *qāhāl.* Ezekiel similarly uses *qāhāl* where *'ēḏâ* would actually be appropriate. Three of the twelve occurrences of *qāhāl* in Ezekiel are especially instructive insofar as they deal with capital punishment by stoning (16:40; 23:46-49) for adultery and murder (16:38; 23:44f.). Although in P such stoning is carried out by the *'ēḏâ* (Lev. 24:16; Nu. 15:35), Ezekiel uses the expression *qāhāl.* There can be but one explanation for this change: the term *'ēḏâ* was not part of Ezekiel's vocabulary.[28]

Levy† — Milgrom

The development sketched here builds on the early dating of P advocated by many Jewish scholars[29] or presupposes at least that P has preserved extremely old material. The customary dating of P yields a different picture. According to L. Rost,[30] P coined the word *'ēḏâ,* an assumption that seems unwarranted after the discovery of Ugaritic witnesses. By contrast, the technical use of the word is characteristic of P. According to K. Elliger's more precise analysis, only the later stratum of P uses the "modern" expression *'ēḏâ,* "while the older stratum uses the older word → קהל *qāhāl,* which originally referred to the 'contingent' of men and was theologically reinterpreted by the Deuteronomistic school."[31] In this view P presents not a realistic portrayal of circumstances obtaining during the oldest period but rather an agenda and an ideal program for the postexilic congregation.

Ringgren

V. Qumran. The word *'ēḏâ* occurs about 100 times in the Qumran writings. Although it was largely adopted in the sense understood by P, the numerous constructions and combinations show that it was by no means understood only in this sense of a popular assembly, legal assembly, and cultic congregation. While in the older scrolls the *'ēḏâ* still represents the self-designation of the Qumran community itself as a "holy congregation" (CD 20:2; 1QS 5:20; 4Q181 1:2), it is soon replaced almost completely by → יחד *yaḥaḏ,* though the strongly eschatological *Rule of the Congregation* again exhibits a retarding tendency (1QSa 1:9; 2:8,21). Here *'ēḏâ* refers to the overall community into which the *yaḥaḏ* is incorporated *(bᵉ)* as a subdivision. According to 1QSa 1:1, the *yaḥaḏ* is the *'ēḏâ* convened as an assembly (cf. also 1QM 2:9). The community associates this particular term with its theology of the poor (4QpPs[a] [4Q171, 4QpPs

28. Cf. Milgrom.
29. Cf. already Y. Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel* (Eng. trans., Chicago, 1960), 175ff.; cf. Hurvitz; Milgrom; also M. Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1978), 146ff.
30. Pp. 38f.
31. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 70.

37] 2:9f.; 3:10), and finds a connection between the earthly and heavenly congregation in the cult (1QM 1:10, *ʿᵃḏaṯ ʾēlîm* par. *qᵉhillaṯ ʾᵃnāšîm;* 4:9; 1QH 3:22; 12:7; 13:8).[32]

The distance from P's understanding of the term becomes clear when *ʿēḏâ* refers to opposing groups as well (1QM 15:9, *ʿdt ršʿh;* 1QH 2:22, *ʿdt blyʿl;* 6:5; 7:34, *ʿdt šwʾ;* 1QS 5:1, *ʿdt ʾnšy hʿwl,* etc.). Finally, the term *ʿēḏâ* is also the ecclesiological *terminus* in Qumran that by means of a suffix can be attached to a person or persons (1QSb 3:3, the chief priest; 1QM 12:9, the Qumran Essenes; CD 8:13, the priest of lies).

Other aspects are possible as well, however. According to 4QpIsa[d] 1:2 (on Isa. 54:11), the *ʿᵃṣaṯ hayyaḥaḏ,* the priests, and the *ʿam* together constitute the *ʿēḏâ* of the elect. By contrast, the construct combination *ʿᵃḏaṯ hayyaḥaḏ* might suggest that the *ʿēḏâ* actually constituted a subdivision of the *yaḥaḏ* (1QSa 2:21; 4QpPs[a] 1-10, IV 19). In any case this expression is "peculiar."[33]

It is quite commensurate with the Temple Scroll's relationship to Deuteronomy that the former hardly uses the term *ʿēḏâ* at all. What occurrences are present are in the material specific to the Temple Scroll itself (i.e., material not found in Deuteronomy). According to 11QT 22:02ff., the entire *ʿēḏâ* is to participate in the festival of new oil before Yahweh. According to 42:14, tabernacles are to be made on the roof of the temple at the Feast of Tabernacles "for the elders of the *ʿēḏâ,* for the princes, the heads of the fathers' houses of the children of Israel, the captains of the thousands, and the captains of the hundreds" (cf. Nu. 1:16).[34]

Fabry

32. Cf. II.8 above.
33. Cf. Maier, 108; Fabry, 207.
34. Cf. II.6 above; → סכך *sāḵaḵ.*

עֵדֶן *ʿēḏen;* עָדַן *ʿāḏan;* עֲדִינָה *ʿᵃḏînâ;* עֲדָנִים *ʿᵃḏānîm;* עֶדְנָה *ʿeḏnâ;* מַעֲדַנִּים *maʿᵃḏannîm;* מַעֲדַנֹּת *maʿᵃḏannōṯ*

Contents: I. Etymology; Translations. II. OT Use: 1. Verb, Adjective, Adverb; 2. Appellative; 3. Proper Names. III. 1. Eden; 2. Ancient Notions of the Garden in Paradise; 3. Garden of Bliss in the OT; 4. Theological Considerations. IV. Qumran.

ʿēḏen. W. Andrae, "Der kultische Garten," *WO* 6 (1952) 485-94; J. Begrich, "Die Paradieserzählung," *GSAT. ThB* 21 (1964), 11-38; A. Bertholet, *Die Gefilde der Seligen. SGV* 33 (1933); idem and H. Gunkel, "Paradies," *RGG²,* IV, 947-52; F. M. T. de Liagre Böhl, A. Jepsen, and F. Hesse, "Paradies," *RGG³,* V, 95-100; K. Budde, *Die biblische Paradiesgeschichte. BZAW*

I. Etymology; Translations. Attempts to explain the various forms from the consonants *ʿdn* in Biblical Hebrew have adduced lexemes from other Semitic languages with the same corresponding consonantal sequence and yet with quite varied derivations and meanings. Decisions concerning the etymological connections applying in any given case are still often a matter of dispute, and we will have occasion to return to this situation later. The first task is to adduce those particular linguistic constructions in related languages that are commensurate with the basic meaning of the Hebrew root *ʿdn.* These include Arab. *ǵadan,* "softness, easy life of luxury," XII "be lush, luxuriant, profuse"; Palmyr. *ʿdnʾ,* "favorable fate"; Middle Heb. *ʿiddûnîm,* "delights," *ʿdn* piel and Syr. pael, "delight, make pleasant,"[1] and recently the Old Aramaic witness *ʿdn* pael, "make flourish, fruitful, bestow abundance."[2] A similar meaning must also be attributed to Middle Heb. *ʿdn* piel in certain contexts (Bab. *Ket.* 10b; *Sifre* on Dt. 32:2), where we read that the rain *meʿaddēn* the fields. The verb cannot mean "water" here, since this was previously expressed by different verbs, but rather "make fruitful."[3]

The Ugar. *ʿdn* remains extremely obscure.[4] Since this language distinguishes between ʿ and *ǵ,* one would expect a root **ǵdn* to correspond to this particular meaning.[5]

The LXX and later Greek translations render Hebrew forms of the base *ʿdn* almost

---

60 (1932); U. Cassuto, *Biblical and Oriental Studies,* vol. 2: *Bible and Ancient Oriental Texts* (Eng. trans., Jerusalem, 1975), 104-7; idem, *Comm. on the Book of Genesis,* 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1961-64), I, 71-177; E. Cothenet, "Paradis," *DBS,* VI, 1177-1220; F. Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* (Leipzig, 1881); T. H. Gaster, *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the OT* (New York, 1969), esp. 24-50 (with bibliog.); K. Galling, "Paradeisos," *PW,* 18/3 (1949), 1131-34; R. Gordis, "The Significance of the Paradise Myth," *AJSL* 52 (1935/36) 86-94; H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (Göttingen, ²1921); F. Hommel, *Die Insel der Seligen in Mythus und Sage der Vorzeit* (Munich, 1901); P. Humbert, *Études sur le récit du paradis et de la chute dans la Genèse* (Neuchâtel, 1940); B. Jacobs-Hornig, "גַּן *gan,*" *TDOT,* III, 34-39 (with bibliog.); A. Jeremias, "Das Paradies, der Sündenfall," *Das AT im Lichte des Alten Orients* (Leipzig, ⁴1930), 79-111; J. Jeremias, "παράδεισος," *TDNT,* V, 765-73; H.-J. Kraus, "The Glorification of the City of God," *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1988), 89-92; G. Lambert, "Le drame du jardin d'Eden," *NRT* 76 (1954) 917-48, 1044-72; J. A. MacCulloch, ed., *The Mythology of All Races* (New York, 1964), index s.v. "paradise"; J. L. McKenzie, "Mythological Allusions in Ezek 28:12-18," *JBL* 75 (1956) 322-27; A. R. Millard, "The Etymology of Eden," *VT* 34 (1984) 103-6; J. Morgenstern, "The Sources of the Paradise Story," *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy* 1 (Cincinnati, 1919) 105-23, 225-40; H. Schmidt, *Die Erzählung von Paradies und Sündenfall. SGV* 154 (1931); A. Schulz, "Eden," *ZAW* 51 (1933) 222-26; J. Skinner, "Paradise and the Fall," *Genesis. ICC* (²1930), 51-97; E. A. Speiser, "*ʾEd* in the Story of Creation," *BASOR* 140 (1955) 9-11; W. Watson, "Paradise in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," *International Journal of Apocrypha* (1914) 74ff.; C. Westermann, "Excursus: 'Eden,'" *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1984), 208-10.

1. *BDB,* 726f.; *HAL,* II, 792; *GesB,* 566f.; E. Ben Yehuda, *Thesaurus Totius Hebraitatis,* 8 vols. (repr. New York, 1960), V, 4337-43 (Heb.).
2. See Millard.
3. Cf. Cassuto. Concerning *ʿdnh* from Kuntillet ʿAjrud, cf. M. Weinfeld, "Kuntillet ʿAjrud Inscriptions and Their Significance," *Studi epigrafici e linguistici* 1 (1984) 121-30.
4. *KTU,* 1.4 V, 68; 1.12 II, 53f.; cf. *CML²,* 154; *WUS,* no. 2011f.
5. But see *CML²,* 144.

without exception with *tryphḗ* or its derivatives (*tryphán, trypherós,* etc.). The Greek designation for "indulgence, luxurious life, mollycoddling," indeed also for "arrogance, pride," apparently no longer had any negative connotations for the linguistic sensibility of these later writers, something evident, e.g., in their use of this form in reference to the sabbath delight (Isa. 58:13, *sábbata trypherá,* Heb. *'ng*). Only when a preceding preposition clearly identifies *'ēḏen* as a designation of place (Gen. 2:8,10; 4:16) does the LXX prefer the transcription *édem (sic).* The Vulg. uses the transcription *eden* only in 4:16, and usually translates with *voluptas,* rarely with *deliciae* (Ezk. 28:13) and *teneritudo* (Jer. 51:34), and once with *paradisus* (Ezk. 31:9; cf. LXX).[6] The Targs. transcribe in many cases, and otherwise use derivatives of the root *pnq* with the meaning "tenderness, spoiling, good living."

II. OT Use.

1. *Verb, Adjective, Adverb.* The meaning "luxuriate, feast, live luxuriously," can be discerned with certainty only in the case of the verbal and adjectival forms, each of which is attested only once. In the postexilic congregation's penitential prayer in Neh. 9:5a-37, thanks is offered to God for having assisted them in taking possession of the fruitful land Canaan, stating that "they [the Israelites] luxuriated [*wayyiṯ'add^{e}nû;* NRSV 'delighted themselves'] in your great goodness" (v. 25). The latter words can refer either directly to the material goods bestowed by God or, more likely, to the divine bestowal of their enjoyment. This resembles a verse in a Qumran hymn: "You [God] will adorn him [the human being] with your splendor, and will cause him to reign amid many delights *('dnym)* with everlasting peace and length of days" (1QH 13:17f.). This does not, however, constitute an unqualified approval of delighting *('dn)* in earthly goods. In the context of a penitential prayer, this expression intends rather to contrast on the one hand divine grace as manifested in the bestowal of a good life, and on the other the human inclination to sin that is unworthy of such grace. The preceding words, "so they ate, and were filled and became fat," as well as the following words, "they were disobedient and rebelled against you" (v. 26), recalling Dt. 32:15, show such luxurious excess as the first step toward apostasy from God. The song of mockery over Babylon (Isa. 47) portrays the latter as a tender and spoiled *(rkh, 'ngh)* virgin (v. 1) who goes about as a mistress untouched by suffering (vv. 5-8). The prophet reproachfully addresses her as *^{a}ḏînâ* (v. 8). Given the context, this can mean neither the "delicate one" (Vulg. *delicata*) nor the "lustful one" (Buber-Rosenzweig, deriving from *'eḏnâ;* see below). (Ibn Ezra also derives this from *'eḏnâ,* "youthfulness.")[7] Rather, the parallel statement "who reigns securely" makes clear that *^{a}ḏînâ* means essentially "who is accustomed to enjoying the luxurious life."

1 S. 15:32 remains unclear. Here we are told that the captured Amalekite king came to his judge *ma^{a}ḏannōṯ* (adv. acc.).[8] If one follows the translators (Aquila, Targs.) and exegetes *(Biblica Rabbinica)* in preserving the usual meaning, one must at least mod-

6. Concerning *parádeisos,* cf. III.1.

7. Cf. P. Joüon, *Notes de lexicographie hébraique. Mélanges de la faculté orientales* (Paris, 1910), 7: "filled with vitality."

8. *GK,* §118q.

ify it slightly as attempted, e.g., by Symmachus (*habrós,* "delicately, daintily") and Buber-Rosenzweig ("cheerfully"). The latter disposition would be commensurate with the king's dignity and courage, or with his erroneous notion that he was about to be pardoned (so the rabbinic comms.). A simpler solution is to begin with the root *m'd* and translate the word as "trembling" (LXX).[9] The assumption of metathesis of the root *'nd,* "bind," is not particularly helpful, since one need not explicitly mention that the prisoner approached his judge "in chains/fetters." The Vulg. translates skillfully as *pinguissimus,* reflecting on the one hand the basic meaning of the root and on the other hand that the Latin word can also mean "calm, composed."

2. *Appellative.* The pl. form *'aḏānîm* refers to that which is associated with a luxurious life, either to a multiplicity of delights or, as a plural of amplification,[10] to the "highest bliss." We cannot determine whether this is a *plurale tantum* or whether the singular is by chance simply not attested. The sg. form **'ēḏen* postulated by lexicons, homonymous with the name of the garden Eden, is an inadmissible petitio principii. From a purely linguistic standpoint, the plural might also derive from the sg. forms **'āḏān, *'aḏān,* or **'eḏen.*

In telling of the blessings of God's fellowship, the psalmist in Ps. 36 also relates how people "feast on the fat of your [God's] house, and the brook of your refreshments (*'aḏāneyḵā*)" (v. 9[8]). Given the context, parallelism, and other use, the latter word must refer to something material, i.e., a refreshing drink. U. Cassuto's interpretation "well-watered meadows" is accordingly not particularly persuasive, though neither is it appropriate to decipher the metaphor in the translation as, e.g., "blisses, delights" while maintaining the literal translation of *dšn* as "fat."[11] At most the word can be understood as *genitivus explicativus,* thus as "your refreshing brook." The metaphor of the sating house and refreshing brook may allude to the sketch, now applied to Jerusalem, of paradise as characterized by abundance and by the river of blessing, a sketch additionally underscored by the choice of a term sounding much like that for Eden.[12] H. P. Chajes makes a similar suggestion in his commentary to the Psalms.[13] Adducing in support Arab. *'dn,* Akk. *adnatu,* and the parallel word "house," he interprets this as "dwelling place." The brook at this place would then be the temple spring (Ezk. 47:1).

The oracle in Jer. 51:33-44 brings serious charges against King Nebuchadnezzar in the name of Jerusalem. "King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon has devoured me . . . swallowed me . . . filled his belly *mē'aḏānāy,* with my delicacies" (v. 34). Here the word obviously means "delicacies" or something similar.

---

9. Cf. S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (Oxford, 1913), 130.

10. *GK,* §124e.

11. So Kraus, in loc.; but cf. also W. Staerk, *Lyrik (Psalmen, Hoheslied, und Verwandtes). SAT* III/1 (Göttingen, ²1920), 208: "meal . . . delights."

12. Cf. W. R. Farmer, "The Geography of Ezekiel's River of Life," *BA Reader* 1 (1961), 284f.; cf. also R. J. Tournay, "Le Psaum XXXVI: Structure et Doctrine," *RB* 90 (1983) 5-22, esp. 16f.

13. *Psalms* (Yitomir, 1903), 79 (Heb.).

Since the use of the prep. *min* after the verb *ml'* is attested elsewhere (Lev. 9:17), our word need not be emended to *maʿᵃḏannāy.*[14] Contra the accentuation, some exegetes associate the word with the following verb, reading "he expelled me from the place of my bliss."[15] This, however, gives the verse an extremely weak conclusion.

The lament for Saul and Jonathan (2 S. 1:24) says that the former clothed Israel's daughters with crimson in *ʿᵃḏānîm* and put ornaments of gold *(ʿᵃḏî zāhāḇ)* on their apparel. In this context the word has presented problems for both translators and exegetes. Only the Targs. maintain the meaning "food delicacies" *(tapnûqîn).* Otherwise the tendency is normally to read the immediately following word *ʿᵃḏāyîm,* "ornaments," here as well.[16] If one uses the more general meaning "delicacies" for *ʿᵃḏānîm,* however, the word can also easily be understood here as meaning "precious clothing."[17] One cannot really justify linguistically the adverbial understanding as "in a charming way" (Buber-Rosenzweig: "in splendid display"), since the prep. *ʿim* is not otherwise so used.

The plural of the *maqṭāl* nominal construction clearly means "selected delicacies," something demonstrated in the oracle of blessing for the tribe of Asher, which settled in a particularly fertile area (cf. Dt. 33:24). The oracle states that it will provide *maʿᵃḏannê meleḵ,* i.e., food delicacies suitable for the royal table (Gen. 49:20).

One medieval commentator (Rashbam) understands the word as referring to the anointing oil for the king (cf. Bab. *Men.* 86a); this, however, misses the parallelism in the verse.

Lam. 4:1-12 portrays the horrible turn of fate experienced by the inhabitants of Jerusalem. It laments that those who were earlier accustomed to eating *maʿᵃḏannîm,* the "finest delicacies," now perish in the streets (v. 5; cf. Targ.; Vulg.: qui vescebantur voluptuose). The word has the same meaning in Prov. 29:17, where parents are admonished that a well-disciplined child will "give delicacies [NRSV 'delight'] to your heart."[18] Here, too, it is best not to weaken the vitality of the metaphor by rendering it abstractly (LXX *kósmos,* "embellishment, splendor"; Buber-Rosenzweig: "bliss").

The word is used rather obscurely in the difficult verse Job 38:31, which speaks of the *maʿᵃḏannôṯ* of a constellation. The parallel word *mōšᵉḵôṯ,* "cords," has prompted exegetes to suspect metathesis of *ʿnd,* "bind," yielding the translation or explanation "bonds, fetters" (LXX, Targ., Rashi, et al.). The Midr. *Gen. Rab.* 10 and several early commentaries, however, maintain the word in its usual meaning, i.e., the constellation associated with the spring makes the fruit "ripen" *(ʿdn).* According to Ibn Ezra, the word stands for the fruit itself that ripens in this particular season.

The hapax legomenon *ʿeḏnâ* refers to something an old person has lost. Sarah resists believing the promise that she will have a son: "After I have grown old, and my hus-

---

14. Contra *BHK; BHS;* J. Bright, *Jeremiah. AB* 21 (1965), 350; and others.

15. Cf. Stenzel, *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (Aschaffenburg, 1957), 988; Bright, *Jeremiah,* in loc.

16. Cf. LXX; Ben Yehuda, in loc.; Driver, *Samuel,* 238.

17. Cf. Kimchi, in loc.

18. B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos. HAT* I/16 (^{2}1963), 100.

band is old, shall I yet have *ʿeḏnâ?*" (Gen. 18:12). Given the context, translators have assumed the meaning "youthful vigor" (Targ.; Symmachus; Joüon) or, picking up on Middle Heb. *ʿiddôn,* the meaning "period, menstruation" (*Gen. Rab.* 48; Rashi). Although in view of Old Aram. *ʿdn,* "be fruitful," one might assume the meaning "fertility," in this particular text (the perfect refers to an individual act rather than an enduring condition), it seems more appropriate to begin with *ʿdn* in the sense of "luxuriate, enjoy," to understand *ʿeḏnâ* as a reference to sexual desire, and to translate something to the effect "bliss of love" (Vulg. *voluptatem operi dabo*). Sarah's other justification for her unbelief also suggests this: "my husband [Abraham] is old."

It is merely etymological sleight-of-hand, prompted by the desire to free the ancestress Sarah from the stigma of aging, when the Midrash (loc. cit.) analyzes the word as *ʿaḏî nāʾeh,* "precious ornaments," and interprets accordingly.

3. *Proper Names.* The personal names with the root morpheme *ʿdn* (*ʿēḏen,* 2 Ch. 29:12; *ʿaḏnaʾ,* Neh. 12:15; *ʿāḏîn,* Ezr. 2:15, etc.), occurring especially in the later OT books, deserve attention here insofar as they demonstrate the positive connotation associated with the root. The name *yᵉhôʿaddān* (2 Ch. 25:1; so also the preferable *Qere* in 2 K. 14:2) adds the theophoric element to the root. Here the *qaṭṭāl* construction, depending on one's understanding of the root's meaning in this particular case, refers to Yahweh as the one who either bestows the joy of life or makes things flourish.[19]

III. 1. *Eden.* The form *ʿēḏen* is used 14 times in connection with the miraculous garden of the primeval period, usually as the designation for that garden; as such, the name Eden has also been adopted by many other languages. In this meaning the word occurs only in the singular and undetermined; it occurs 9 times as *nomen rectum* in genitive combinations, including 5 times after (the *nomen regens*) *gan,* "garden."

In the expression *ʿdn brkh* in Sir. 40:27, it might itself be the *nomen regens* in the sense "Eden of blessing," i.e., a blessed Eden (cf. 2 Ch. 20:26). The other interpretation, that on which the LXX is based, is also permissible: "fear of the Lord is like Eden, a blessing."

This use might indicate that this is actually a personal name, either that of a garden or of a region in which that garden is found. The former understanding is supported by the overwhelming number of occurrences, especially by the expression "the garden *ʿēḏen*" (Gen. 3:23), the latter by the phrase "a garden in *ʿēḏen*" (2:8; cf. v. 10, which stands, however, in an addendum dependent on that verse).[20]

This determination of place is then also explicated adverbially by *miqqeḏem,* which from a purely linguistic standpoint is ambiguous, meaning either spatially "in the east" (cf. Gen. 12:8), thus correctly most exegetes, or temporally "in the most distant past" (cf. Ps. 143:5), thus the later Greek translators and the rabbinic and church traditions,

---

19. M. Noth, *IPN,* 166, 223; Loewenstamm, *EMiqr,* III, 536.
20. A different view is taken by Schulz, who reads "garden in bliss."

suggesting the preexistence of Eden: "quod prius quam caelum et terram deus faceret, paradisum ante condiderat."[21]

Rabbinic exegesis already felt compelled on the basis of Gen. 2:8 and 10 to distinguish between the garden and Eden (Bab. *Ber.* 34b), raising the question regarding which was the more comprehensive term. The phrase "the trees of Eden that were in the garden" (Ezk. 31:9) suggests that the area of the garden was larger than that of Eden, while the expression "garden in Eden" (Gen. 2:8) prompts precisely the opposite conclusion (*Gen. Rab.* 16). In any case, Eden is the mysterious, otherworldly region hidden even from the view of the first human beings, who were permitted to linger only briefly in the garden (Bab. *Ber.* 34b).

Since the days of the pan-Babylonian explanation of the Bible, many scholars have accepted the derivation of the word *'ēḏen* from Sumero-Akk. *edinu,* "steppe, wilderness," describing the semantic development as follows.[22] "'Eden,' which popular Hebrew tradition interpreted according to the Hebrew word *Eden* = bliss, is probably originally to be understood according to the Babylonian as 'steppe' . . . the frightening, enormous steppe region about whose terrible dangers the Canaanite farmer speaks with horror. . . . The garden of God seems all the more splendid if situated in the middle of this frightening wilderness."[23] This etymology, however, is subject to serious doubts. Not only is the insertion of the laryngeal ' in a word deriving from Sum. *e* difficult to explain, so also is the transference within Hebrew tradition of a designation for a wasteland to the verdant garden that precisely this tradition locates within that wasteland.[24] It would be especially remarkable that this process left absolutely no other traces apart from these isolated biblical verses. Thus this attempt at localization more likely represents only a secondary development occasioned either by an inclination to demythologize or by false erudition, the reference perhaps being either *edinu* or the Aramaic place-name *bīt adini* (cf. *bêt 'eḏen,* Am. 1:5).

Hence the word *'ēḏen,* its etymology, and its semantic development need a different explanation,[25] even if such explanation must remain hypothetical. In antinomy to *miḏbār,* "wilderness" (Isa. 51:3), the word *'ēḏen* probably referred originally to a luxuriantly fertile area, a "fruitful land" (such as the *'ereṣ p^e^rî,* Ps. 107:34). (U. Cassuto's explanation as "well-watered area," to be equated with *mašqeh* [Gen. 13:10], is substantively correct if linguistically imprecise.) The linguistic stage perhaps recalls the fixed expression *'ᵃṣê 'ēḏen* (Ezk. 31:9,16,18), one that, like *'ᵃṣê mayim* (v. 14), is used in the sense of "trees typical of a well-watered, fertile area." This concept can easily be associated with those from a neighboring conceptual sphere, namely, those associated

21. Jerome, *Quaest. hebr. in libro Geneseos,* in loc.

22. See Delitzsch, 79f.; *AHw,* I, 187; *CAD,* IV, 33.

23. H. Gunkel, *Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen. SAT* I/1 (²1920), 57f.; cf. E. A. Speiser, *Genesis. AB* 1 (1964), 16.

24. Concerning the region *edin,* cf. T. Jacobsen, "Formation Tendencies in Sumerian Religion," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East. FS W. F. Albright* (Garden City, N.Y., 1961), 272f.

25. Cf. also M. Görg, "Ijob aus dem Lande *'ûṣ:* ein Beitrag zur 'theologischen Geographie,'" *BN* 12 (1980) 7-12.

with a garden of the gods or of a god, or Yahweh's garden, since a fertile area is viewed not only as a gift of a deity but as the possession of that deity as well. Sanctuaries and the gardens surrounding them belong together. Similarly, the notion of the gods' inaccessible, mythical garden of delights arises through the transference of earthly circumstances to the heavenly world of the gods. The ancient *gan 'ᵉlōhîm,* a relic of a polytheistic myth, was later transferred to the one God and associated with the name Yahweh (Gen. 13:10; Isa. 51:3; cf., e.g., the alteration of the older formula *mahpēḵaṯ 'ᵉlōhîm,* Am. 4:11, et passim, in Dt. 29:22[Eng. v. 23]). The term *'ēḏen* was then equated with this garden (Ezk. 28:13), yielding the combination *gan 'ēḏen* (Gen. 2:15); the elliptical proper name *'ēḏen* (Gen. 4:16) returns in a certain sense to early usage.

2. *Ancient Notions of the Garden in Paradise.* Stories about fields of unencumbered bliss are found all over the world. In talking about the proximity of God, opulence in nature, eternal youth, effortless existence, and peace among all creatures, these stories lend expression to the deep human yearning for deliverance from the existential distress of powerlessness and renunciation, suffering and death. The impossibility of such fulfillment is expressed by displacing these fields into distant, inaccessible temporal or spatial locations, e.g., into the primeval age or the end time, or into a space blocked off by insuperable barriers, such as an island, a high mountain, or heaven. Although this is not the place to examine the development of this notion in the various cultures, still several motifs from the literature of Israel's neighbors do deserve brief mention. The Sumerian myth about the lord of the waters, Enki, extols the land Dilmun, a land facing the rising sun where sickness and old age are unknown, where animals such as the wolf and lamb live peacefully alongside one another, where the most beautiful fruits grow, and where a gardener, probably a subordinate divine being, works.[26] Because Enki then eats from the newly generated plants, the goddess of the land, Ninhursag, utters a curse against him. In the Akkadian Gilgamesh Epic, the hero, searching for eternal life, overcomes high mountains and fearsome guards before entering a marvelous divine garden whose trees bear the sweetest fruits and precious stones.[27] In the Adapa narrative, which tells of Eridu, the land of the gods, the god Ea grants the hero knowledge but not immortality.[28] Ill advised, Adapa refuses the bread of life and water of life offered to him.

Ugaritic literature tells of the domain of the gods, thousands upon thousands of miles away, situated at the source of the two rivers *(nhrm)* and primal seas *(thmtm).*[29] Ba'al's seat is in the far north *(ṣpn).*[30] Youthful Aqhat misses the chance to gain eternal life by not eating Ba'al's food.[31]

The Egyptian Pyramid and Coffin Texts as well as the Book of the Dead combine

---

26. *ANET,* 37-41.
27. *ANET,* 88f.
28. *ANET,* 101f.
29. *KTU,* 1.6 I, 5f.
30. *KTU,* 1.4 IV, 19.
31. *ANET,* 151f.

notions of lushly fruitful fields and of blessed human existence with belief in the beyond. If the deceased are able to pass the tests of the underworld and reach the "field of peace" *(sḫt ḥtp),* which is guarded by flames and monsters, the gods allow them to eat from the tree of life from which they, too, eat.[32] In this region, crisscrossed by rivers, human beings eat and dress like the gods.[33]

3. *Garden of Bliss in the OT.* Several OT passages indirectly offer information about the ancient Hebrews' understanding of the land of bliss and the time of happiness. Such is the case, e.g., when the fruitfulness of the land (Dt. 32:13f.) and majesty of Jerusalem (Ps. 48:3[2]) are described in effusive colors, or when prosperity and peace among human beings and animals is foretold for the future (Isa. 2:4; 11:6-8; 65:25; Hos. 2:20-23[18-21]; Joel 4:18[3:18]; Am. 9:13f., etc.). In the present context only those passages are of interest that speak specifically about *ʿēḏen.* In two different parables (Ezk. 28; 31), the prophet Ezekiel uses several motifs based on earlier conceptions in order to illustrate contemporary events. The extraction of these motifs, however, is rendered somewhat difficult by the abrupt transitions between the metaphors themselves and their decipherment (e.g., 28:16-18; 31:11f.). Nor can one determine here the extent to which these actually reflect Israelite-Jewish traditions. Because the parables involve foreign kings, some degree of interweaving with foreign, particularly Phoenician, elements would certainly be understandable and would also explain the strongly mythological coloring of the parables. Nonetheless, one may assume that the prophet was not presenting his listeners with wholly unfamiliar material.

Aside from allusions to concrete historical details, Ezk. 28 tells of a being of extraordinary beauty and wisdom living in the seat of the gods — either in the midst of the sea (v. 2) or on the mount of the gods (v. 16) — in the *ʿēḏen* of the garden of the gods (or of God), surrounded by jewels and fiery stones and with a cherub as guardian (vv. 12-14, with LXX, Syr., contra MT). That creature was godlike (v. 14, to be read contra the accentuation: "I placed you on the holy mountain, you were an *ʾᵉlōhîm*"), and blameless in his ways (v. 15). But because he then became proud (v. 17) and equated himself with God (v. 6), Yahweh cast him to the ground and turned him to ashes (vv. 17f.).

The oracle directed against the pharaoh (Ezk. 31) compares him with the mythical tree of the world whose branches, nourished by the waters of the primeval sea (v. 4), towered high into the clouds (v. 3; see *BHS*). Birds and animals found shelter in the tree, and all the other trees of Eden in God's garden envied it (v. 9). Because its heart became proud, however, Yahweh delivered it into the hand of cruel foreigners, who felled it (vv. 11f.) and cast it down with the trees of Eden to the underworld (v. 18).

The actual paradise story (Gen. 2f.) exhibits sufficient points of contact with the accounts in the book of Ezekiel to allow us to view all of them as variations of the basic theme "Eden," variations that were obviously circulating in Israel. Within the frame-

---

32. *RÄR,* 169f.
33. Egyptian Book of the Dead, ch. 110.

work of these possibilities, however, the paradise story itself does exhibit a clear tendency to engage in demythologization. It never calls the garden the "garden of God," though it certainly understands it as such (Gen. 3:8). The garden has not existed since the primeval time, but rather is planted specifically for the human being whom God has just created (2:7f.). Apart from the tree of life and the tree of knowledge, no other miraculous plants grow there, but only beautiful and useful trees (v. 9). The inhabitant of the garden is not some half-divine figure but the first human being, who must take care of the garden (v. 15). He is given a woman as his companion, providing an etiology for the origin of human beings (vv. 23f.). The serpent is characterized more by fairy-tale elements than by mythological ones; it is the serpent, not any pseudodivine human hubris, that causes the fall of human beings (3:1-13). The expulsion from the garden of Eden becomes the etiology of human fate, characterized on the one hand by the sublimity of the human consciousness of existence, and on the other by the tragedy of toil and of death.

4. *Theological Considerations.* The changes that occurred in the understanding of *ʿēḏen* can perhaps be described as follows from a conceptual-historical (rather than chronological) perspective. The term *ʿēḏen,* the fruitful region, is equated with the garden of the gods borrowed from foreign sources in which a half-divine being rules. In the course of monotheistic interpretation, mythological elements recede. The garden *ʿēḏen* comes to symbolize a condition, inaccessible to human beings, of innocence and carefree existence. The demythologization then continues in two diametrically opposed directions. In postbiblical Judaism (2 Enoch 8f.; Bab. *Ḥag.* 15a; *Cant. Rab.* on Cant. 6:9) and in Christianity (Lk. 23:43; 2 Cor. 12:2-4), Eden becomes the heavenly beyond for the deceased righteous, while in the OT itself the garden *ʿēḏen* pales into the mere designation for an extremely favorable but utterly earthly condition. Prior to its desolation, the land was like the garden *ʿēḏen* (Joel 2:3); Yahweh promises that after he has cleansed the people of their sins, he will again have them settle the land, work it, secure it, and make it like *ʿēḏen* (Isa. 51:3; Ezk. 36:35). From a religious perspective, divine compassion thus makes Eden — either in the beyond or in the here and now — accessible again to human beings.

IV. Qumran. The term *ʿdn* occurs only 5 times in Qumran, exclusively in 1QH. Among the texts, only 6:16 actually refers to Eden itself in comparing the righteous with a tree whose branches are watered by the "rivers of Eden" (an allusion to Ps. 1). Otherwise, it receives "glorious bliss" (*ʿdn kbwd,* 8:20) from God, and the "fullness of delights" (*rwb ʿdnym,* 13:17; cf. 10:30; 1QH fr. 5:7).

Kedar-Kopfstein

עֵדֶר *'ēḏer*

Contents: I. Occurrences Outside Israel. II. OT and Qumran; Etymology. III. OT Usage. IV. Qumran, NT, LXX.

I. Occurrences Outside Israel. The word *'ēḏer,* "flock, herd," corresponds to words in other Semitic languages in the OT world. The Late Babylonian term *ḫadiru,* "sheepfold,"[1] is a loanword; the Phoenician Kilamuwa inscription uses the noun in the combination "flock of sheep."[2] Jewish Aramaic attests the following possibilities: (1) flock, herd; (2) figuratively: crowd of people;[3] (3) fold.[4] Ugaritic witnesses attest *'dr* in a context difficult to interpret and in the PN *bn 'dr.*[5]

II. OT and Qumran.

1. *OT.* The noun *'ēḏer* occurs 39 times in the OT in reference primarily to the small livestock herd consisting of sheep and goats, so that *'ēḏer* and → צאן *ṣō'n* are frequently used synonymously (Gen. 29:3; 1 S. 17:34; Ps. 78:52; Ezk. 34:12; Mic. 2:12; et passim), while the expression *'ēḏer bāqār* occurs only once (Joel 1:18; in 2 Ch. 32:28 and Mic. 5:7[Eng. v. 8] *'ēḏer* parallels → בהמה *behēmâ*). G. Dalman's statistics concerning livestock holdings in the countryside west of the Jordan from the year 1920 are thus still impressive, since at that time he counted 531,479 sheep and goats and only 108,500 head of cattle.[6]

Whereas the place-name *migdal-'ēḏer* (Gen. 35:21; Mic. 4:8) is to be rendered "Flock Tower" (NRSV Tower of Eder), the PNs *'ēḏer* and *'aḏrî'ēl* derive from the root *'dr* = *'zr.*[7]

2. *Qumran.* The Qumran writings contain 2 occurrences of *'ēḏer* (4Q171 [4QpPs[a], 4QpPs 37] 3:6; CD 13:9). While the first occurrence does not yield any clear meaning given the lacunae in the text, the second will be treated in connection with the use of *'ēḏer* in the OT.[8]

'ēḏer. G. J. Botterweck, "Hirt und Herde im AT und im Alten Orient," *FS J. Kardinal Frings* (Cologne, 1960), 339-52; G. Dalman, *AuS,* VI (1939), 146-287; J. Jeremias, "ποιμήν, ποίμνη," *TDNT,* VI, 485-502; I. Seibert, *Hirt. Herde. König: Zur Herausbildung des Königtums in Mesopotamien. DAWB* 53 (1969); Wagner.

1. *AHw,* I, 307.
2. *KAI,* 24, 11.
3. See III.2.c below on Jer. 13:17.
4. *WTM,* III, 624.
5. *KTU,* 1.4 VII, 7. See *WUS,* nos. 2013, 2014; *UT,* nos. 1800, 1826. On the proper name see III.3 below.
6. *AuS,* VI, 246.
7. *HAL,* II, 793; cf. S. Segert, *Altaramäische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1975), 545; see III.3 below.
8. See IV below.

3. *Etymology.* The etymology of *ʿēḏer* is uncertain. *GesB* derives *ʿēḏer* from *ʿdr* III, "remain behind," but also mentions the interpretation advocated by R. Ružička: a reference to "something separated off from the whole."[9] *GesB* also adduces a verb *ʿdr* I with the meaning "order, organize" (1 Ch. 12:34,39[33,38]), which according to Gesenius is the root of *ʿēḏer.*[10] Recent scholars replace *ʿdr* in these passages with a conjecture or explain it as an Aramaic form of → עזר *ʿzr.*[11] The derivation suggested by *KBL*[2] might be correct, however, which denominates *ʿdr* in 1 Ch. 12:34,39(33,38) with the meaning "gather, collect (intransitive)" from *ʿēḏer,* "flock," which can certainly also occur in the basic qal stem.[12]

III. OT Usage.

1. *Flocks in Narrative Texts.* The passages using the word *ʿēḏer,* "flock, herd," provide a vivid picture of a specialized branch of commercial agricultural life in the OT: small livestock herding. Gen. 29:2f. describes the activity of watering sheep at a well;[13] Joel 1:18 describes the loss of food for the flocks as a result of a locust plague. Shepherds are charged with protecting the flocks, and as a rule they discharge this duty in multiples rather than alone (Cant. 1:7; cf. 1 S. 17:34). They drive the flock into the protective fold accompanied by a certain sound known as the "piping of the flocks" (Jgs. 5:16).[14] Although guard or observation towers were probably also situated near the folds (Gen. 35:21; Mic. 4:8; cf. also 2 Ch. 26:10),[15] animals from the flock were still sometimes purloined (Job 24:2). A similarly impious act is for a flock owner to present a blemished, inferior animal for the thanksgiving offering (Mal. 1:14). Proper attention to one's flocks is a good investment (Prov. 27:23), which is why Hezekiah of Judah has stalls and folds built for his flocks (2 Ch. 32:28). The story of Jacob and Laban (Gen. 30:25-43) describes with both savvy and humor how a person skilled in livestock herding can acquire wealth. Jacob knows how to protect his own considerable flocks from the vengeance of his brother Esau (Gen. 32:17-20). Jeremiah describes farmers and shepherds as inhabitants who either enjoy a peaceful life (Jer. 31:24) or are annihilated by the advancing enemy (51:23).

2. *The Flock as a Metaphor.* This more concrete usage, making up approximately half the occurrences, can be juxtaposed with the metaphorical usage, which in its own turn can be subdivided into several classifications.

a. Grazing flocks can symbolize coming disaster. Prophetic oracles often announce imminent disaster to a city by using the metaphor of flocks grazing in meadows where formerly great, prosperous, secure cities were located. Such oracles are issued to Da-

---

9. *GesB,* 567.

10. *GesTh,* II, 996.

11. For the former see *BHS;* for the latter, *HAL,* II, 793; Wagner, no. 217.

12. Cf. *BLe,* §38v'.

13. → באר *beʾēr* (I, 463-66).

14. Cf. in this regard O. Eissfeldt, "Gabelhürden im Ostjordanland," *KlSchr,* III (1966), 65f.

15. → מגדל *migdāl* (VIII, 69-73).

mascus (Isa. 17:2), Jerusalem (Isa. 32:14; Jer. 6:3, where the initiator of disaster is the mysterious "enemy from the north," v. 1), and Nineveh (Zeph. 2:14[10]).

b. Grazing flocks can symbolize Yahweh's care and concern, something Israel already experienced during the exodus from Egypt. Ps. 78 accordingly describes Israel's wilderness wanderings in the image of the shepherd who guides his flock through the steppe (v. 52), and the promises of a "new exodus" not surprisingly also pick up on this imagery (Isa. 40:11; Jer. 31:10; Ezk. 34:12; Mic. 2:12).

c. In addition to the grazing flock as the comparative element, authors also use the notion of the flock or herd as a metaphor or even symptom of Yahweh's people.[16] This is clearly the case in Zec. 10:3, which metaphorically equates the leading personalities among the people with shepherds *(rô'eh)*.[17] Jer. 31:10 and Mic. 2:12 merely allude to this equivalence by means of the verb → קבץ *qbṣ*, at times complementing this in the second half of the verse with the metaphor of grazing flocks.[18] Only one passage (Jer. 13:17,20) uses the metaphor of Israel as a herd in an oracle of threat. V. 20 specifically calls Judah the flock entrusted to the city Jerusalem.[19] *Midr. Lam. Rab.*, proem, §25, picks up on v. 17, stating that "when they went into exile, they were merely 'a [God's] flock.'"[20]

d. Flocks can be used metaphorically in several other contexts as well. Mic. 5:7(8) states that the remnant of Jacob will appear among the nations "like a lion among the animals of the forest, like a young lion in the sheepfold,"[21] a statement that is both unusual and disturbing, especially following immediately upon v. 6. This recalls Zeph. 2:7,9, and almost certainly dates from the postexilic period.[22]

The statements in Canticles are of a completely different kind. They compare the girl's beautiful black hair with the flocks of goats that move down the forested slopes of Gilead (Cant. 4:1 par. 6:5), or her perfectly even, white teeth with the flock of shorn ewes coming up from the washing (4:2 par. 6:6).

3. *Personal and Place-Names.* Personal and place-names constructed with *'ēḏer* occur in several OT passages as well as in Ugaritic. Both a Benjaminite (1 Ch. 8:15) and a Levite from the family of Merari (23:23; 24:30) are called *'ēḏer*, and one of Saul's sons-in-law is called *'aḏrî'ēl* (1 S. 18:19; 2 S. 21:8). In Ugarit the name *bn 'dr* is presumably based on the Aramaic form *'dr* = *'zr*.[23] J. Simons suggests emending the place-name *'ēḏer* in Josh. 15:21 to Arad.[24]

---

16. Cf. Seibert, 10-15.
17. → רעה *rā'â*.
18. See III.2.b above.
19. W. Rudolph, *Jeremiah. HAT* I/12 (^{3}1968), in loc.
20. *WTM*, III, 624.
21. Translation according to T. H. Robinson, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. HAT* I/14 (^{2}1954), in loc.
22. Cf. H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1990), 151.
23. *UT*, no. 1826. Cf. *IPN*, 63; Wagner, nos. 215-17; *PNU*, 107.
24. *GTTOT*, §317; so also O. Odelain and R. Séguineau, *Lexikon der biblischen Eigennamen* (Ger. trans., Düsseldorf/Neukirchen, 1981), 86 (not in *Dictionary of Proper Names and Places in the Bible* [Eng. trans., Garden City, N.Y., 1981], 104).

The meaning of the place-name *migdal-'ēḏer* in Gen. 35:21 and Mic. 4:8 is uncertain. "Flock towers" were doubtless used for protecting the flocks while in their folds.[25] D. Kellermann thinks the reference is more likely to watchtowers or citadel towers, and suspects that *hammigdāl haggāḏôl* in Neh. 3:27 is the same as in Mic. 4:8.[26] The name of this particular tower in the city fortifications of Jerusalem (par. *'ōpel*) possibly recalls an earlier watchtower of the sort also known as the Tower of the Flock (NRSV "tower of Eder") near Bethel (Gen. 35:21).[27] Some interpreters understand *migdal-'ēḏer* in Mic. 4:8 as a synonym for Jerusalem.[28] Understanding the expression here as a place-name (probably under the influence of Mic. 4:8), Targ. Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen. 35:21 states that the messiah will descend to earth at the *migdal-'ēḏer*.[29]

IV. Qumran, NT, LXX. Among the uses of *'ēḏer* in the OT discussed above (III.2), only the metaphor of the people of God as the flock under Yahweh's protective, shepherding eye continued to be used in theological statements. CD 13:9 states that the guardian of the camp "shall love them as a father loves his children, and shall carry them in all their distress like a shepherd his sheep." The NT then also uses this metaphor of the congregation as a flock (cf. Mt. 15:24; Lk. 12:32; Jn. 10:16; 1 P. 5:2, etc.).

In most instances (25 times), the LXX renders *'ēḏer* as *poímnion;* in 8 instances, including 6 in wisdom texts (Ecclesiastes, Canticles), it uses *agélē.* Twice the translation is *poímnē,* once each *mándra* (2 Ch. 32:28) and *boukólion* (Joel 1:18).

Beyse

---

25. Cf. I. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie: Angelos-Lehrbücher,* I (Tübingen, [3]1927), 142; C. Shick, "Die Baugeschichte der Stadt Jerusalem in kurzen Umrissen," *ZDPV* 16 (1893) 237-46, who provides a sketch of such an edifice on pp. 238f., figs. 1 and 2.

26. → VIII, 72.

27. Cf. in this regard M. Burrows, "Neh 3,1-32 as a Source for the Topography of Ancient Jerusalem," *AASOR* 14 (1934), 115-40; cf. M. Avi-Yonah, "The Walls of Nehemiah: A Minimalist View," *IEJ* 4 (1954) 239ff.

28. Odelain and Séguineau, *Dictionary,* 265; J. Simons, *GTTOT,* §540, considers this, then interprets it here as in Gen. 35:21 as "outpost of the Holy City near Bethlehem."

29. Jeremias, 490.

עוד *'wd;* עֵד *'ēḏ;* עֵדוּת *'ēḏûṯ;* תְּעוּדָה *tᵉ'ûḏâ*

Contents: I. 1. Semitic Cognates; 2. Etymology and General Meaning; 3. OT Occurrences; 4. Syntactic and Semantic Considerations; 5. LXX. II. *'ēḏ/'ēḏîm/'ēḏâ:* 1. Legal Contexts; 2. Outside the Court Setting; 3. Religious Contexts; 4. Yahweh as Witness; 5. Objects as Witnesses in Legal Contexts; 6. Religious Contexts. III. *'wd* Hiphil/Hophal. 1. Hiphil in Connection with *'ēḏ;* 2. Hiphil in Connection with *'ēḏûṯ/'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ;* 3. Hophal. IV. Other Nominal Forms: 1. *'ēḏûṯ;* 2. *'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ;* 3. *tᵉ'ûḏâ.* V. Qumran.

'wd. S. Aḥituv, "עֵדוּת," *EMiqr,* VII, 89-91; J. Beutler, *Martyria: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Zeugnisthema bei Johannes. FThS* 10 (1972); H. J. Boecker, *Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT. WMANT* 14 (²1970); P. Bovati, *Ristabilire la giustizia: Procedure giuridiche dell'AT. AnBibl* 110 (1986), 240-80; G. Braulik, "Die Ausdrücke für 'Gesetz' im Buch Deuteronomium," *Bibl* 51 (1970) 39-66; W. Bühlmann, *Vom rechten Reden und Schweigen: Studien zu Proverbien 10–31. OBO* 12 (1976); A. Deissler, *Psalm 119 (118) und seine Theologie. MTS* I/11 (1955); M. Delcor, "Les attaches littéraires, l'origine et la signification de l'expression biblique 'Prendre à témoin le ciel et la terre,'" *VT* 16 (1966) 8-25; B. W. Dombrowski, "The Meaning of the Qumran Terms 'T'WDH' and 'MDH,'" *RevQ* 7 (1969-71) 567-74; Z. W. Falk, "Hebrew Legal Terms," *JSS* 5 (1960) 350-54; idem, *Hebrew Law in Biblical Times* (Jerusalem, 1964); C. F. Fensham, "'d in Exodus xxii 12," *VT* 12 (1962) 337-39; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefîre. BietOr* 19 (1967); E. D. Freudenstein, "A Swift Witness (*'ēd mémāhēr,* Mal 3,5)," *Tradition* 13/3 (1974) 114-23; M. J. Geller, "The Šurpu Incantations and Lev V.1-5," *JSS* 25 (1980) 181-92; H. Gese, "Ps. 50 und das alttestamentliche Gesetzesverständnis," *Rechtfertigung. FS E. Käsemann* (Tübingen, 1976), 57-77; J. M. Grintz, "עֵדָה, עֵדוּת," *Leš* 39 (1974/75) 170-72; M. Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford, 1978); R. Hentschke, *Satzung und Setzender. BWANT* 83 (1963); F.-L. Hossfeld, *Der Dekalog: Seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen. OBO* 45 (1982); B. S. Jackson, "'Two or Three Witnesses,'" *Essays in Jewish and Comparative Legal History. SJLA* 10 (1975), 153-71; M. A. Klopfenstein, *Die Lüge nach dem AT* (Zurich, 1964); C. van Leeuwen, "עֵד *'ēd* witness," *TLOT,* II, 838-46; A. Lemaire and J. M. Durand, *Les inscriptions araméennes de Sfiré et de l'Assyrie de Shamshi-Ilu. École pratique des hautes études,* 4th section, II/20 (Paris, 1984); G. Liedke, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. WMANT* 39 (1971); M. A. Losier, "Witness in Israel of the Hebrew Scriptures in the Context of the Ancient Near East" (diss., Notre Dame, 1973); C. Mabee, "Jacob and Laban: The Structure of Judicial Proceedings (Genesis xxxi 25-42)," *VT* 30 (1980) 192-207; J. W. McKay, "Exodus xxiii 1-3,6-8: A Decalogue for the Administration of Justice in the City Gate," *VT* 21 (1971) 311-25; R. P. Merendino, "Die Zeugnisse, die Satzungen und die Rechte: Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu Deut 6," *Bausteine biblischer Theologie. FS G. J. Botterweck. BBB* 50 (1977), 185-208; J. Naveh, "The Titles ŚHD/'D and MNḤM in Jewish Epigraphical Texts," *Studies in Bible and the Ancient Near East. FS S. E. Loewenstamm,* 2 vols. (Jerusalem, 1978), II, 303-7 (Heb.; Eng. summary in vol. I, 204); M. Parnas, "'Ēdût, 'Ēdôt, 'Ēdwôt in the Bible, against the Background of Ancient Near Eastern Documents," *ShnatMiqr* 1 (1975) 235-46; J. van der Ploeg, "Studies in Hebrew Law, I: The Terms," *CBQ* 12 (1950) 248-59; A. Phillips, *Ancient Israel's Criminal Law: A New Approach to the Decalogue* (Oxford, 1970); W. Rudolph, "Zu Mal 2,10-16," *ZAW* 93 (1981) 85-90; I. L. Seeligmann, "Zur Terminologie für das Gerichtsverfahren im Wortschatz des biblischen Hebräisch," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS*

I. 1. *Semitic Cognates.*

a. *General Considerations.* The etymological relationships involving the root *'wd* are rather complicated. For semantic reasons, Arab. *'āda(u),* "return," and Eth. *'ōda,* "go around, surround," can hardly be related to Heb. *'wd.* The OSA term *'wd* means "return," causatively "reestablish" (often with "peaceful relationships," "alliance," or similar terms as its object).[1] Traces of this root can probably also be found in Hebrew (עוד I)[2] and in Syr. *'ᵉyāḏā,* Palmyr. *'yd',*[3] "custom" (cf. Arab. *'ādat* with the same meaning). The Arabic term corresponding to Heb. → יעד *yā'aḏ* is *wa'ada,* "to promise," III, "arrange to meet." These probably represent different expansions of a single root *'d.*[4] The relationship between these and Syr. *'hd,* "remember," Arab. *'ahida,* "know, be acquainted with," "entrust" (*'ahd,* "alliance, contract"), and OSA *'hd,* "make an alliance, obligate oneself," is unclear.[5]

b. *Aramaic.* The inscriptions of Sefire contain approximately 33 occurrences of Aram. *'dy,* "contract, pact," "contractual terms," "oath, agreement secured through an oath."[6] The word is otherwise undocumented in Aramaic.

c. *Akkadian.* The Akk. term *adû* appears first in the dependency contract that Ashurnirari V forced on Mati'ilu of Arpad ca. 755 B.C. ("the oaths of allegiance sworn to Ashurnirari, King of Assyria").[7] Such an "oath" *(adû)* is a written agreement between a higher ranking partner and servants or subjects.[8] The treaty was reinforced by magical or religious customs (ceremonies, imprecations, incantations),[9] and was actually a law or commandment ceremoniously forced on an individual or people in the presence of divine witnesses and attested by the liege lord. It contained a specific responsibility or obligation (depending on the perspective of the liege lord or vassal, respectively) ceremoniously accepted on the basis of an oath.[10]

d. *Ugaritic.* The Ugar. term *'d* III has been associated with Arab. *'āda,* "return," *'ādat,* "custom," Eth. *'ōda,* "go around," and translated as "repetition," "turning point,"

W. Baumgartner. SVT 16 (1967), 251-78; S. Sharviṭ, "יעידת עד," *Leš* 41 (1976-77) 302f.; H. J. Stoebe, "Das achte Gebot (Exod. 20 v. 16)," *WuD* 3 (1952) 108-26; J. A. Thompson, "Expansions of the *'d* Root," *JSS* 10 (1965) 222-40; G. M. Tucker, "Witnesses and 'Dates' in Israelite Contracts," *CBQ* 28 (1966) 42-45; T. Veijola, "Zu Ableitung und Bedeutung von *he'id* I im Hebräischen: Ein Beitrag zur Bundesterminologie," *UF* 8 (1976) 343-51; B. Volkwein, "Masoretisches *'ēdût, 'ēdwōt, 'ēdōt* — 'Zeugnis' oder 'Bundesbestimmungen'?" *BZ* 13 (1969) 18-40; K. Watanabe, *Die âdê-Vereidigung anlässlich der Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons. Baghdad Mitteilungen* 3 (Berlin, 1986).

1. Biella, 307.
2. *HAL,* II, 795.
3. *DNSI,* II, 838f.
4. See Thompson.
5. Biella, 356. Cf. *HAL,* II, 788, s.v. *'ēḏ.*
6. *KAI,* 222-24, ca. 750 B.C. For the translations see Fitzmyer, 23; Lemaire and Durand, 95.
7. Cf. H. Tadmor, "The Aramaization of Assyria: Aspects of Western Impact," *RAI* 25 (1982) 456; *ANET,* 532f.
8. *AHw,* I, 14; cf. Tadmor, "Aramaization of Assyria," 468 n. 113.
9. *CAD,* I/1, 131, 133b.
10. Cf. D. J. Wiseman, *The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon. Iraq* 20/1 (London, 1958), 22-23, 27, 28.

"society."[11] By way of conjecture, C. H. Gordon finds in several personal names the term *ʿd* = Heb. *ʿēḏ,* then translates *tʿdt,* "messenger" (similar to *tᵉʿûḏâ,* "witness, message"), and suggests *ʿd* accompanied by a question mark for *ʿdk.*[12] G. del Olmo Lete translates "all around you" (cf. Eth. *ʿōda*).[13]

e. *Hebrew.* Hebrew understands *ʿēḏ,* "witness, attestation," as a *qaṭil* with contraction deriving from *ʿwd* or as a qal participle.[14] The fem. form of *ʿēḏ* is *ʿēḏâ,* "attestation, female witness." The term *tᵉʿûḏâ* with prefixed *t* indicates that the substantives derive from a verbal root *ʿwd.* The term *ʿēḏûṯ* is constructed from *ʿēḏ* with the abstract affix and has two pl. forms, *ʿēḏᵉwôṯ* and *ʿēḏôṯ,* with no discernible semantic difference between them (cf. 2 K. 23:3 with 2 Ch. 34:31).[15]

2. *Etymology and General Meaning.* Despite traditional opinion, one can at present hardly doubt the Aramaic origin of Akk. *adû* (from *ʿdy;* see above).[16] By contrast, the etymology of the Aramaic term itself is quite open to discussion. One possibility is a connection with *ʿwd,* "attest, witness," probably in view of the gods as witnesses.[17] The Heb. term *ʿēḏûṯ* seems to derive from Aramaic.[18]

In any case, the semantic correspondences between Aram. *ʿdy,* Akk. *adû,* and Heb. *ʿēḏûṯ* are evident, and aid in explaining the frequent secondary meaning of the Hebrew terms as "regulations, commandments."[19] In all likelihood the meaning of *ʿēḏûṯ,* "contractual regulations," in certain individual cases derives from this context.[20] The aspect of "entering into a relationship with another person by means of a formal statement" remained associated with the term *ʿēḏ* as the person who testifies or is in a position to testify to throw light on the facts of a case in a trial. The meanings of *ʿwd* hiphil cover a broad spectrum and can be classified in two larger groups depending on their (implicit or explicit) connection with *ʿēḏ* or *ʿēḏûṯ.*[21]

Hence it does not seem necessary to explain the various meanings of *ʿwd* hiphil on the basis of Arab. *ʿāda,* "return," or Eth. *ʿōda,* "go around," whereby one understands the meaning "admonish," "warn," as implying "state repeatedly and urgently," and "attest, witness," as implying an act through which a person "brings something back," i.e., refers to a past event by means of the spoken word.[22]

---

11. *WUS,* no. 1999.
12. *UT,* nos. 1817, 1832. For *ʿdk* see *KTU,* 1.6 VI, 48f.; *UT,* no. 1815.
13. *Mitos y leyendas de Canaán según la tradición de Ugarit* (Madrid, 1981), 235.
14. See, respectively, *BLe,* §61c‴; *LexHebAram,* 573.
15. JM, I, §88 Mj. Cf. Volkwein, 19; Lemaire and Durand, 96.
16. Cf. Tadmor, "Aramaization of Assyria," 455.
17. *KAI,* 222B:4, though cf. Fitzmyer, 81, 86f., who reads *ʿwrn,* "who are watchful." See the gods as "witnesses" in *KAI,* 222A:12; Lemaire and Durand, 94f.
18. Lemaire and Durand, 102.
19. See IV.2.
20. See III.2.
21. See III.1.2.
22. Cf. van Leeuwen, *TLOT,* II, 839f.; Seeligmann, 265-66; Thompson, 223-25; and the criticism raised by Veijola, 343f.

3. *OT Occurrences.* The occurrences of the root *'wd* in the OT are distributed as follows:

	'ēḏ	*'ēḏîm*	*'ēḏûṯ*	*'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôt*	*'wd* hiphil
Gen.	4				2
Ex.	3		21		2
Lev.	1		2		
Nu.	2	1	12		
Dt.	9	5		3	5
Josh.	3	2	1		
Ruth		3			
1 S.	3				2
1 K.				1	3
2 K.			1	2	2
1 Ch.				1	
2 Ch.			2	1	1
Neh.				1	6
Ps.	1	2	7	27	2
Prov.	11				
Job	2	1			1
Lam.					1
Isa.	1	1			1
Dt.-Isa.	1	5			
Jer.	2	4		1	8
Am.					1
Mic.	1				
Zec.					1
Mal.	1				1
	45	24	46	37	39

To these one can add 4 occurrences of *'ēḏâ* (Gen. 21:30; 31:52; Josh. 24:27[bis]); 3 of *tᵉ'ûḏâ* (Isa. 8:16,20; Ruth 4:7), and 1 for the hophal (Ex. 21:29). Sirach contains 2 occurrences of *'wd* hiphil and 3 of *'ēḏûṯ*.

Personal names using the root *'wd* probably include *yô'ēḏ* (Neh. 11:7)[23] and *gal'ēḏ* (Gen. 31:47). Questions remain concerning the identification of *'ôḏēḏ* (2 Ch. 15:1,8; 28:9) as a personal name or as an epithet for the prophet (one who warns?) and the association of *'el'āḏ/'el'āḏâ* (1 Ch. 7:20f.) with *'wd.* In Isa. 33:8 MT *'ārîm* is probably to be read *'ēḏîm* or *'āḏîm* ("contracts"); cf. 1QIsa[a], *'dym.*[24]

4. *Syntactic and Semantic Considerations.* a. *'wd hiphil.* Within the semantic field of *'ēḏ,* the term *'wd* hiphil occurs with the dir. obj. *'ēḏîm* (Isa. 8:2; Jer. 32:10,25,44) or

23. Cf. *IPN,* 162f.

24. Cf. *BHS;* Fitzmyer, "The Aramaic Suzerainty Treaty," *CBQ* 20 (1958) 456.

"heaven and earth" (Dt. 4:26; 30:19; 31:28), with the meaning "seek out, appoint witnesses, present as witnesses." The addressee of such witnessing is introduced by b^e (Dt. 4:26; 30:19; 31:28; Ps. 50:7) or *'ēṯ* (1 K. 21:13), in the sense of a witness "against someone." The juridical aspect of witnessing is expressed by *ʿwd* hiphil + *bên . . . ûḇên* (Mal. 2:14). Both Yahweh and human beings can be the subject. Within the semantic field "inform, notify,"[25] b^e introduces the addressee of the action expressed by *ʿwd* hiphil (the only exception being Jer. 6:10, *ʿal;* Neh. 13:15 is problematic). The verb is construed as follows: absolutely (2 Ch. 24:19; Neh. 9:30; 13:15; Ps. 81:9[Eng. v. 8]; Jer. 11:7; 42:19; Am. 3:13); coordinated with a different verb as a hendiadys (1 S. 8:9, *higgîḏ* + dir. obj.; Neh. 13:21, *'āmar;* Jer. 6:10, *dibber;* 11:7, *hiškîm* + *lē'mōr*); with a direct object anticipated by *'ašer* and then picked up again (Dt. 32:46; 2 K. 17:15; Neh. 9:34); introducing a clause paratactically with *lē'mōr* (Gen. 43:3; Ex. 19:23; 1 K. 2:42; 2 K. 17:13; Zec. 3:6); introducing an object clause with *kî* (Dt. 8:19) or a subordinated clause with *pen* (Ex. 19:21), or a final clause (Neh. 9:26,29).

Yahweh is the frequent subject of *ʿwd* hiphil. In this context he "warns" or "admonishes" his people either directly (Ex. 19:23; 2 K. 17:15; Neh. 9:29,34; Jer. 11:7; 42:19; Zec. 3:6, "angel of Yahweh"; Ps. 81:9[8]), or through Moses (Ex. 19:21; Dt. 8:19; 32:46), Samuel (1 S. 8:9), or the prophets (2 K. 17:13; Neh. 9:26,30; 2 Ch. 24:19). Other subjects of *ʿwd* hiphil include Joseph (Gen. 43:3), Solomon (1 K. 2:42), Nehemiah (Neh. 13:15,21), and an undetermined plural (Am. 3:13). It is uncertain whether in Jer. 6:10 the subject is Yahweh himself or the prophet.

b. *ʿēḏ*. The term *ʿēḏ* occurs with the prep. b^e, "witness against" (Dt. 31:19,26; Josh. 24:27 [*ʿēḏâ*]; 1 S. 12:5; Jer. 42:5; Mic. 1:2), or with *bên . . . ûḇên* (Gen. 31:44,48,50; Josh. 22:27,28,34; it is also construed with *kî* [so that, that] to designate the content of the witness: Josh. 24:22; 1 S. 12:5; Isa. 19:20). The expression *hāyâ l^eʿēḏ* (Gen. 31:48; Dt. 31:19,21,26; Job 16:8; Isa. 19:20; Jer. 42:5; Mic. 1:2) or *l^eʿēḏâ* (Gen. 21:30; Josh. 24:27) expresses the anticipation, desire, and confirmation that someone or something proves to be a witness against someone or has been appointed such. The verbs most frequently appearing with *ʿēḏ* include *hēʿîḏ* + *ʿēḏîm,* "take as a witness" (Isa. 8:2; Jer. 32:10,25); *ʿēḏ* + *qwm* + b^e, "appear as a witness against someone" (Dt. 19:15,16; Job 16:8; Ps. 27:12; 35:11); *ʿānâ* b^e, "charge, accuse" (Ex. 20:16; Nu. 35:30; Dt. 5:20; 19:16,18; Prov. 25:18; cf. *ʿānâ l^epānāyw,* Dt. 31:21); *hēpîaḥ,* "utter" (in general, "lie," Prov. 6:19; 12:17; 14:5; 19:5,9).[26] The presentation of evidence is expressed by *hēḇî'* + *ʿēḏ* (Ex. 22:12[13]), and the allusion to a witness's statement by *l^epî/ʿal-pî ʿēḏîm* (Nu. 35:30; Dt. 17:6; 19:15). The term *śāhēḏ* (par. to *ʿēḏ,* Job 16:19) is an Aramaic loanword.

5. *LXX.* The LXX generally translates all the lexemes of the root *ʿwd* with expressions belonging to the basic verb *martyreín.* These include *diamartýresthai* (19 times); *epimartýresthai* (7); *diamartyreín* (3); also *katamartyreín, martyreín,* and *poieín*

---

25. Cf. III.2.

26. Cf. D. Pardee, "YPḤ 'Witness' in Hebrew and Ugaritic," *VT* 28 (1978) 204-13.

mártyras. It translates *'ēḏ* 45 times with *mártys,* 9 times with *martýrion,* 6 times with *martyreín,* and twice with *martyría.* The translations of *'ēḏ* by *ánthrōpos* (Isa. 8:2), *engyán* (Prov. 19:28), and *étasis* (Job 10:17) were probably prompted by stylistic considerations or by difficulties with the Hebrew text. The term *'ēḏûṯ* is translated 36 times with *martýrion* (also the translation of *tᵉ'ûḏâ*), 4 times with *diathḗkē,* and once with *martyría.* The two terms *'ēḏâ* and *'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ* together are translated 41 times with *martýrion.*[27]

II. *'ēḏ/'ēḏîm/'ēḏâ.* One can distinguish six different semantic fields for *'ēḏ* depending on whether it refers to an individual, a group, an object, or Yahweh, and whether it exhibits legal meaning (in the strict sense, i.e., in a trial before a court or outside a trial situation) or figurative religious meaning.

1. *In Legal Contexts.* a. *Meaning.* The category that can be identified most precisely is that of the witness before a court. Lev. 5:1 offers what is almost a definition of the *'ēḏ* as a person who has either seen or otherwise learned of a deed with regard to which a person is obligated to testify. This obligation is imposed by means of a conditional curse.[28] The expression *qôl 'ālâ* is not necessarily the curse that the victim utters against the perpetrator, but rather the public summons by the "legal authorities" (elders, etc.). Lev. 5:1 thus describes the witness who has seen or learned and is obligated to testify *because of* the summons. Yet not every person who is an eyewitness is also *eo ipso* a witness in the juridical sense.[29] The seriousness of the witness's obligation derives from the guilt that person would incur by refusing to testify *(nāśā' ᵃwônô).*[30]

The law concerning jealousy underscores the importance of the witness for justice (Nu. 5:11-31). This law subjects the woman suspected of adultery to the judgment of God in cases where the husband can produce no witnesses (v. 13). The absence of witnesses immediately prompts the insertion of God into the legal process. The potential power of witnesses made it necessary to limit their authority at a certain point and to demand moral guarantees; at least two witnesses were required for cases involving death sentences for murder (Nu. 35:30) or idolatry (Dt. 17:6). In the latter case the witnesses also had to carry out the actual sentence of death to assume full responsibility for their testimony (17:7). Dt. 19:15 expands this standard of "two or three witnesses" to apply to all cases; such are even required for beginning proceedings *(qûm dāḇār;* NRSV "to sustain a charge") "for any crime or for any wrongdoing" *(lᵉḵol-'āwôn ûlᵉḵol-ḥaṭṭā't).* The standard regarding multiple witnesses is not found in the earliest texts (cf. 19:16-19).

b. *Integrity of Witnesses.* Many texts express concern with ensuring the ethical integrity of witnesses. The technical expressions *'ānâ-bᵉ* and *'ēḏ* in the apodictic statement *lō'-taᵃneh bᵉrēᵃḵā 'ēḏ šāqer,* "you shall not bear false witness against your neighbor" (Ex. 20:16), refer to a specific regulation designed to prevent witnesses from lying in court. Dt. 5:20 repeats this regulation using the term *'ēḏ šāw'.*

---

27. Concerning the nuances of these expressions, see H. Strathmann, "μάρτυς," *TDNT,* IV, 474-514; Beutler, 106-18.

28. Cf. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 73f.

29. Cf. the differing view of J. Scharbert, → אָלָה *'ālâ ('ālāh),* I, 263.

30. → עון *ᵃwōn.*

This distinction has often been explained as a corrective on the part of Deuteronomy, which expands the regulation in Exodus and makes it more precise. That is, every kind of false witness is forbidden, not only the intentional one but the one given carelessly as well, and not only in the juridical sphere but in any circumstances. The expression *'ēḏ šeqer* emphasizes more the relationship of the witness to the *rēa'*, while *'ēḏ šāw'* characterizes more clearly the disposition of the witnesses themselves.[31] For F.-L. Hossfeld, the parallels to Dt. 5:20 (Ex. 23:1-9, *šāw'* and *šqr* occur in vv. 1a,7a; Hos. 4:2; 10:4; 12:12[11]; etc.) show that the two terms are synonymous in the context of adjudication.[32] The association with the Covenant Code and with Hosea militates in favor of Dt. 5:20 being older. That is, Ex. 20:16 allegedly corrected Dt. 5:20 to attenuate the relationship between the prohibition against misusing Yahweh's name (which uses *šāw'*) and the sphere of legal adjudication. At the same time the theological component of this prohibition is emphasized.[33]

Dt. 19:16-19 explicates in casuistic formulations the precautions necessary for preventing the abuse of the witness's position. The expression *'ēḏ ḥāmās* (v. 16) may not be understood in the objective sense as someone "who brings a charge of violent transgression representing apostasy *(sārâ)* from Yahweh,"[34] nor simply as a "false witness" or "witness of a violent deed," but rather commensurate with the semantic spectrum of *ḥāmās* itself as the plaintiff who is thinking of attempted murder.[35] The expression *'ānâ bᵉ* X *sārâ,* "to testify falsely about X (in court,"[36] seems to allude to the dishonesty of a witness, though only after a confrontation between the plaintiff and the defendant in court and before the priests, and only after careful investigation is a witness declared false *('ēḏ šeqer)* because he or she has accused a neighbor falsely (*šeqer 'ānâ bᵉ'āḥîw,* v. 18), whereupon the false witness is declared guilty of a capital crime. This legislation closely follows the substance of CH 1–4.[37]

The interpretation of *'ēḏ ḥāmās* in Ex. 23:1b reveals slight differences depending on whether one understands v. 1b as an explication of v. 1a, "you shall not spread a false report *(šēma' šāw'),*" or v. 1a,b as two parallel clauses of one Decalog for dealing with the administration of justice. In the first instance the admonition not to become "a malicious witness" would be directed to all the members of the community who are involved in a legal matter.[38] In the second instance v. 1b would be addressing the judges

---

31. Klopfenstein, 18-21, with reference to J. J. Stamm, *Der Dekalog im Lichte der neueren Forschung* (Bern, ²1962).

32. Hossfeld, 75-78; cf. J. F. A. Sawyer, "שָׁוְא *šāw'* deceit," *TLOT,* III, 1310-12.

33. Hossfeld, 85.

34. Stoebe, 120.

35. Seeligmann, 263, with reference to G. R. Driver and J. C. Miles, *The Babylonian Laws,* 2 vols. (Oxford, ²1956), I, 62. → חָמָס *ḥāmās (chāmās),* IV, 484.

36. E. Jenni, "Dtn 19,16: *sarā* 'Falschheit,'" *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux. FS H. Cazelles. AOAT* 212 (1981), 201-11.

37. Cf. Driver and Miles, *Babylonian Laws,* I, 62.

38. M. Noth, *Exodus. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1962), 172. Cf. also comms. by H. Cazelles, U. Cassuto (Eng. trans., Jerusalem, 1967), and B. S. Childs, *OTL* (1974), in loc.

and/or the witnesses. The OT, however, does not provide any positive information supporting this hypothesis.

c. The other texts describing witnesses advise caution with regard to this obligation and enjoin punishments for bearing false witness, referring to the witness as *'ēḏ šeqer* (Ps. 27:12; Prov. 6:19; 14:5; 25:18) or as *'ēḏ š^e^qārîm* (Prov. 12:17; 19:5,9), "false witness." The expression *'ēḏ-k^e^zāḇîm,* "mendacious witness," appears in 21:28. Parallel expressions or synonyms include *yāpîaḥ k^e^zāḇîm* (6:19; 14:5,25; 19:5,9), "who presents/breathes out lies" (or, understanding *yāpîaḥ* as a subst. = Ugar. *ypḥ,* "witness," hence "mendacious witness"), "filthy liar";[39] *y^e^p̱ēaḥ* (Ps. 27:12) and *'ēḏ ḥāmās* (pl., Ps. 35:11; see above); *'ēḏ ḥinnām* (Prov. 24:28; LXX presupposes *'ēḏ ḥāmās*), the witness who abuses the legal process by testifying to satisfy his own personal vengeance or in general intends to deliver testimony that will result in the defendant being punished;[40] *'ēḏ b^e^lîya'al* (Prov. 19:28; cf. 1 K. 21:10,13), the witness whose testimony is destructive because the witness voluntarily falsifies the facts.[41] Antonyms include *'ēḏ '^e^meṯ* (Prov. 14:25) and *'ēḏ '^e^mûnîm* (14:5), a dependable, truthful, loyal, reliable witness (cf. also *yāpîaḥ '^e^mûnâ,* 12:17).

Prov. 25:18 seems to allude directly to the eighth commandment: *'îš 'ôneh b^e^rē'ēhû 'ēḏ šeqer,* "one who bears false witness against a neighbor," is like a war club, a sword, or a sharp arrow. In 14:5 it is not easy to decide whether the proverb is defining the *'ēḏ šeqer* or characterizing the liar in general as a person who is as bad as an *'ēḏ šeqer.*[42] According to 14:25, the *yāpîaḥ k^e^zāḇîm* is deception and falsehood *(mirmâ)* personified. The mention of the *'ēḏ '^e^meṯ* in v. 25a as one who saves lives anticipates the contrast. Prov. 12:17 reverses the structure and accentuation of 14:25. Prov. 21:28 is similarly antithetical, asserting that the false witness whose testimony is untrue or cannot be proved will perish because this deception cannot be maintained. The *'îš šômēa'* who listens attentively, becomes informed, and weighs his testimony will offer enduring words, and one will always be able to count on what that person says. That is, this proverb does not apply only to the juridical sphere.

Prov. 6:19 concludes the unit of vv. 16-19, which describe the *'ēḏ šeqer* through an enumeration of eyes, tongue, hands, heart, feet, i.e., the parts of the body that participate in the act of bearing false witness. This interpretation is supported by the explicit association of mouth and *'ēḏ* (Nu. 35:30; Dt. 17:6; 19:15; Prov. 19:28), of hand and *'ēḏ* (Ex. 23:1, possibly recalling the custom of laying one's hands on the defendant at the moment of accusation), and of "hand" and "mouth" (Ps. 144:8,11) in describing the adversary's actions in an imaginary trial.[43]

The contrast between *'ēḏ šeqer* and *'ēḏ '^e^mûnîm/'^e^meṯ* (Prov. 14:5,25) characterizes the mendacious, false witness not only as someone who utter lies (*k^e^zāḇîm* refers only to false statements) but also as someone who is unreliable and untrustworthy in general

---

39. Bühlmann, 93-99, 161-69.
40. W. McKane, *Proverbs. OTL* (1970), 574.
41. Ibid., 529.
42. Bühlmann, 164-67.
43. Bovati, 259.

relationships with others, both in the juridical (here the expression is strongest) and in the more private sphere.[44]

Psalm 27 refers to a legal procedure taking place perhaps before a priest. The mention of the *'ēḏê-šeqer* "who have risen against me *(qāmûbî)*" and "breathe violence" (v. 12) summarizes the list of the psalmist's adversaries *(meréʿîm, ṣāray, 'ōyeḇāy, šôreray)* and demonstrates concretely how the adversaries of an individual behaved within organized society. The expressions of trust in Yahweh (vv. 1-6 in the hymn of trust, though also vv. 7-13 in the lament)[45] indicate that the reference is no longer to a legal proceeding. In that case vv. 12b and 13 must be interpreted as unreal conditional clauses in which the protasis (v. 13) follows on the apodosis: "False witnesses would rise against me . . . if I were not certain. . . ."[46]

Ps. 35 contains an even greater collection of terms describing such adversaries. The *'ēḏê ḥāmās* in v. 11 occupy approximately the central position within the list. Several technical expressions from legal proceedings ("malicious witnesses rise up [*qûm*]; they ask me about things I do not know," v. 11; "they conceive deceitful words [*diḇrê mirmôṯ*]," v. 20, by claiming that "our eyes have seen him," v. 21) suggest that this psalmist is involved in court proceedings and is encountering the kind of corruption that can indeed arise there. The other expressions perhaps describe metaphorically the witnesses and their behavior. Such portrayals of unjust court proceedings occur in the Psalms especially in the laments of the individual.

2. *Outside the Court Setting.* In two prophetic texts *'ēḏîm* (pl.) refers to witnesses outside the court setting. Yahweh commands Isaiah to write down a peculiar sentence (the name of his future son; Isa. 8:2) and have it attested by two reliable witnesses so that the text with his message might be recognized in the public life of the city, and so that one might not later accuse him of forgery.[47] The presence of witnesses in the business contract in Jer. 32 is of similar significance. The detailed description of the various documents of the contract, repeated three times at important junctures in the account (vv. 10,25,44; *'ēḏîm* also in v. 12), shows the importance of the legal procedure involved in Jeremiah's symbolic act. His gesture is to be as official as possible and to include Yahweh's obligation to reestablish his people.[48] Only in these two texts does *'ēḏîm* (pl.)[49] appear as the direct object of *'wd* hiphil.

The distinction between summons and notarial actions of witnesses emerges clearly in the old story of Ruth. Boaz takes *(lāqaḥ)* ten elders with him to court and addresses them with the formula *'ēḏîm 'attem hayyôm,* "today you are witnesses" (Ruth 4:9f.), to attest that he has acquired both the property of Elimelech and the right to marry Ruth.

---

44. Klopfenstein, 26.
45. Cf. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1-59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 332f.
46. Cf. J. Niehaus, "Use of *lûlē* in Psalm 27," *JBL* 98 (1979) 88f.; Kraus takes a different view.
47. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12. OTL* (Eng. trans. [2]1983), in loc.
48. → III, 267.
49. Cf. III.1.

"We are witnesses" (*'edîm,* v. 11) is the formal declaration of the witnesses in confirming the concurrence of the purchase contract with normal law.

The function of the witnesses is clear despite a certain degree of textual ambiguity that seems to associate the tradition of the levirate (Dt. 25:5-10) with that of the *gō'ēl* (Lev. 25:25-34).[50] The text also explains the gesture of taking off and giving away one's sandals differently than does Dt. 25:9 by defining it as a *te'ûdâ.*[51] H.-F. Richter views the marriage between Boaz and Ruth as a levirate contract and not as a function of the *gō'ēl.*[52] The differences over against Dt. 25 would then betray the presence of pre-Deuteronomic redaction of Ruth.

3. *Religious Contexts.* The formula for summoning witnesses (without *hayyôm* and with the prep. *be*, "witness against") also occurs in the Deuteronomistic redaction of Josh. 24 (v. 22), followed by the formula signifying acceptance of the summons. In the case of disloyalty toward Yahweh, the people's own declaration becomes a witness against them. Such use of formulae is no longer a strictly legal element but now essentially religious, and includes the full consciousness of the people regarding its obligations when they chose to accept Yahweh as their only God.

The same religious meaning of *'ēd* is discernible in several texts from Deutero-Isaiah as well. Isa. 43:8-13 freely renders a court scene between Yahweh and the gods (to whom only the *bāhem* of v. 9aβ alludes).[53] Yahweh has juxtaposed a blind and deaf people over against the totality of nations. The dispute itself involves "declaring" (*ngd* hiphil) the capabilities or lack thereof of Yahweh or the gods, and "interpreting" the present and past. The text mentions witnesses 3 times: v. 9bα, *'ēdêhem* ("their [the gods'] witnesses"); vv. 10,12, *'attem 'ēday* ("you are my [Yahweh's] witnesses"). Yahweh challenges the gods to produce witnesses who can show whether they have learned anything from the "history lesson" (the declaration and interpretation of *zō't* and *ri'šōnôt,* i.e., present-future and past) of their protectors. The absent witnesses of the gods are juxtaposed with Yahweh's witnesses ("you"), who attest *kî 'anî hû'* (v. 10; cf. vv. 11,12),[54] "that I am he." These witnesses do not function to testify in favor of a defendant (a meaning virtually unknown in the OT), something Yahweh does not need in any case. Nor do they function as witnesses for the prosecution or as notarial witnesses who were present at a given event and testify accordingly before the court. Yahweh's "witnesses" constitute an argument by their very presence. Isa. 43:10 and 12 reverse the formula of witness summons. The positioning of *'attem* before *'ēday* (cf. Ruth 4:9f.) draws attention to the quality of this "you." The fulcral argument attesting the veracity of the statement "I am" is that precisely this blind and deaf people is capable of recognizing God's acts in the midst of his people. Because the idols offer no in-

50. → גאל *gā'al* (II, 350-55).

51. G. Gerlemann, *Ruth. Das Hohelied. BK* XVIII (²1981), 37; cf. J. J. Stamm, "גאל *g'l* to redeem," *TLOT,* I, 290f.

52. "Zum Levirat im Buch Ruth," *ZAW* 95 (1983) 123-26.

53. Cf. W. Zimmerli, "Jahwes Wort bei Deuterojesaja," *VT* 32 (1982) 104-24. → עבד *'ābad.*

54. → III, 344.

terpretation of history, they have no "witnesses/disciples"; "there were none who heard your words" (Isa. 41:26b).

Isa. 44:6-9 uses the same argumentation as 43:8-13 in introducing polemically its mockery of those who make idols. Yahweh is the only one who can interpret (i.e., declare) what has happened in the past and what will happen in the future (v. 7). For this, "you are my witnesses" (v. 8), while "their witnesses" (those of the idols, v. 9) understand ("see") nothing.

Isa. 55:4 applies the title *'ēḏ le'ummîm,* "witness for the peoples," to the king (or *'ēḏ le + 'ummîm,* "witness for the tribes," which would be preferable, since *'ēḏ* in the construct state usually designates the characteristic of the witness rather than the addressee of the testimony).

J. H. Eaton views the title *'ēḏ* as a summary of the king's duty as one who encourages and admonishes, as one who has experienced Yahweh's salvation and revelation and has proclaimed such to the nations, and as one who is himself a sign. These characteristic features appear in numerous psalms.[55] The question is why *'ēḏ* allegedly refers to the king only here if the nuances of the title were themselves so numerous and apparent.

If one understands Isa. 55:1-5 as a text democratizing the messianic hope and transferring the expectations previously ascribed to the king to the people,[56] then vv. 4 and 5a must be read as an emphatic juxtaposition of *hēn.* Yahweh appointed David as his witness, but now "a nation that you [Israel] do not know shall run to you."

In Job 10:17 the military tone of the passage suggests translating *'ēḏêḵā* as "assault, attack" (adducing in support Arab. *'dw*) or "warrior" (cf. Ugar *'dn*),[57] excluding the (still frequent) translation "witnesses."

4. *Yahweh as Witness.* In 5 or 6 texts Yahweh himself is the "witness." In 1 S. 12:5 Samuel reinforces his own declaration of innocence with a kind of imprecation by calling upon the witness of Yahweh and his anointed against the people *(bāḵem).* In the event of some charge against Samuel for injustice, it is thus Yahweh himself and the king who will intervene in his defense. By declaring *'ēḏ* ("he is witness"; cf. the discussion of Ruth 4:9,11 above), the people accept this witness. Hence *'ēḏ* must be added to v. 6 (following LXX) as an explication of Yahweh being mentioned.[58] (Sir. 46:19 alludes to this event with *hē'îḏ,* with Samuel "bearing witness" [declaring] that he has acquired nothing unjustly.)

Similar formulations that function differently include Mic. 1:2 *(wîhî . . . YHWH bāḵem le'ēḏ)* and Jer. 42:5 *(yehî YHWH bānû le'ēḏ 'emeṯ wene'emān 'im lō').* In Micah this (redactional?) verse solemnly introduces an oracle against Israel in the presence of the peoples.[59] Yahweh himself is the witness rather than summoning other witnesses,

55. "The King as God's Witness," *ASTI* 7 (1970) 25-40, esp. 26-27.
56. G. von Rad, *OT Theology,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans., New York, 1962-65), II, 240.
57. *KTU,* 1.14 II, 32-34; W. G. E. Watson, "The Metaphor in Job 10,17," *Bibl* 63 (1982) 255-57.
58. Cf. P. K. McCarter, *I Samuel. AB* 8 (1980), 210.
59. Cf. H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1990), 40.

so *bāḵem* must be understood as "among you" rather than as "against you." In Jer. 42:5 the people summon Yahweh against themselves in an oath formula of self-imprecation to apply if they do not keep Yahweh's commandment as mediated by Jeremiah. This expression thus proves to be the equivalent of the more frequent *ḥay YHWH 'im (lō')*.

It is difficult to determine whether *baššāmayîm 'ēḏî* in Job 16:19 refers to Yahweh. The function of this witness (v. 20 is parenthetical) is expressed in strictly juridical language; the witness will defend the person over against God (*weyôḵaḥ le* + *'im,* v. 21). Since the witness cannot be identified with God, who then can function as a witness or judge between a person and God (cf. 9:33)? Is Job thinking of a "son of God" of the sort mentioned in 1:6 and 2:1, or of an intercessory angel as in 33:23-24?[60] Or is he juxtaposing a personal God over against the highest, transcendent God of the theodicy of Deutero-Isaiah?[61] The assertion seems justified that two different understandings of God are at odds in Job, understandings that the book objectifies as antithetical.[62]

At the end of the announcement of punishment against the false prophets of salvation in Jer. 29:23, Yahweh refers to himself as the "witness who knows" *(hayyôḏēa', Q),* possibly an allusion to the prerequisites for witnesses presented by Lev. 5:1 (though possibly also an instance of dittography).[63]

In Mal. 3:5 Yahweh announces his arrival for judgment *(lammišpāṭ)* as the *'ēḏ memahēr,* "swift witness" (against sorcerers, adulterers, etc.). Here the function of the witness within the court proceedings is not secondary but rather identical with that of the judge who can act swiftly because he was himself a witness.[64]

5. *Objects as Witnesses in Legal Contexts.* Various objects can function as juridical witnesses in the case of arrangements and agreements. In Gen. 21:30 the seven lambs Abraham gives to Abimelech serve as witnesses *(hāyâ le'ēḏâ)* that he has dug the well. The story of Jacob's contract with Laban (31:43–32:1, probably subjected to considerable redaction) mentions *'ēḏ* 4 times. It is unclear what *hāyâ le'ēḏ bênî ûḇêneḵā* means in v. 44; the agreement itself cannot be viewed as an *'ēḏ.* In vv. 48 and 52 the heap of stones functions as an *'ēḏ.* V. 52 lacks *bênî ûḇêneḵā,* while *'ēḏ* stands before *haggal hazzeh* and parallels *we'ēḏâ hammaṣṣēḇâ.* The phrase *'elōhîm 'ēḏ bênî ûḇêneḵā* explicates the meaning of *'ēḏ* in v. 48. The heap of stones functions as representative and admonisher for the will of the participants when they are separated (v. 49b), and God himself effectively becomes the representative of the witness when one of the participants does not keep the agreement by taking advantage of the fact that "no one else is with us" (v. 50).

The complex formulation of v. 52 betrays the intention of combining two different functions encompassing both the heap of stones and the *maṣṣēḇâ* at different redactional stages. If they were "witness(es)," the formulation would be a condition

60. Cf. *Traduction oecuménique de la Bible* (Paris, 1975f.), in loc.
61. Cf. J. B. Curtis, "On Job's Witness in Heaven," *JBL* 102 (1983) 549-62.
62. → גָּאַל *gā'al,* II, 355.
63. Cf. *BHS.*
64. Cf. W. Rudolph, *Haggai, Sacharja 1–8, 9–14, Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 280.

with *'im.* The apodosis arranges for the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor to judge. If one understands the heap of stones and *maṣṣēḇâ* as "boundary," the formulation would fix the will of the partners by way of negation not to cross over the fixed boundaries. Whereas the remarks concerning the boundaries address an issue between tribes, the agreement between Laban and Jacob in its own turn addresses an issue between the families.

Ex. 22:12(13) is part of the laws of the Covenant Code dealing with specific cases of compensation for losses,[65] and is the only OT text in which *'ēḏ* refers to legal evidence with regard to a previous deed. If a person has borrowed an animal, and the animal is "mangled by beasts," the person is to present the remains (before the tribunal, *y^eḇi'ēhû 'ēḏ haṭṭ^erēp̄â*) and is released from further restitution.

In Josh. 22:27,28,34, *'ēḏ* refers to an altar. This account picks up a preexilic tradition concerning a Yahwistic altar that stood near the Jordan and served as a boundary sanctuary.[66] A certain tension becomes clear between the (Yahwistic?) formulation in v. 27, which refers to an altar for the cult, and the priestly formulation in v. 28, where the altar functions obviously and exclusively as a witness to the connection between Reuben and Gad and the remaining Israelite tribes (cf. vv. 24-25) without claiming to establish a new cultic center. Both formulations betray a concern with preserving the ethnic and religious connection with the "nine-and-a-half tribes" despite the physical distance and the natural boundary of the Jordan. V. 34, which concludes the narrative, seems mutilated, since "Yahweh is God" cannot be the explanation of the noun "testimony/witness."

6. *Religious Contexts.* Moses' song, a monument, a *maṣṣēḇâ,* an unidentified "witness in the clouds," and Job's pain are the "objects" that function as religious witnesses.

Yahweh commands Moses to write down the song and teach it to the Israelites *l^ema'an tîhyeh-lî haššîrâ hazzō'ṯ l^e'ēḏ biḇnê yiśrā'ēl* (Dt. 31:19), and announces that if the people break the covenant, *w^e'ān^eṯâ haššîrâ hazzō'ṯ l^epānāyw l^e'ēḏ* (v. 21). These two expressions underscore the two complementary aspects of *'ēḏ.* On the one hand, it is a witness for the defense on Yahweh's side against Israel. Israel will recall Yahweh's history with his people and will have no right to accuse Yahweh when all has been fulfilled. On the other hand, the song's content (v. 21) will be a continual witness for the prosecution against the people. The song as *'ēḏ* has the same authority as the book of the law alongside the ark of the covenant *l^e'ēḏ b^eḵā* (Dt. 31:26), as a witness for the prosecution against Israel.

Similarly, the altar Joshua erects (Josh. 24:27, twice *hāyâ l^e'ēḏâ bānû/bāḵem*) functions as a witness against the people because it has heard everything Yahweh told his people.

---

65. Cf. F. C. Fensham, "Das Nicht-haftbar-Sein im Bundesbuch im Lichte der altorientalischen Rechtstexte," *JNSL* 8 (1980) 17-34.

66. Cf. J. S. Kloppenborg, "Joshua 22: The Priestly Editing of an Ancient Tradition," *Bibl* 62 (1981) 370.

Isa. 19:19-22 does not explain in what sense the altar and *maṣṣēḇâ* might function as a sign and witness for Yahweh (v. 20) with regard to the Egyptians. Is the reference to a monument erected for the Egyptians to remind Yahweh of his salvific acts in Egypt (on behalf of the Hebrews during the early period)? Or to a monument built through Yahweh's inspiration emphasizing the enduring quality of his intentions? The ambiguity of → אות *'ôṯ* provides no help in resolving this question.

The *'ēd baššaḥaq* in Ps. 89:38(37) cannot be identified with certainty. The witness is not explicitly identified with the sun and moon (vv. 37ff.[36ff.]); these comparisons bring to expression the enduring validity of the promises with regard to throne and descendants, though the allusion might be to one of the two, or in a more general sense to one of the *bᵉnê 'ēlîm* (v. 7[6], which also has *baššaḥaq*). The presence of this witness in the heavenly court (cf. Job 16:19-21) secures "by law" that the promises to the king will be upheld, and at the same time offers him an advocate who will represent his interests before God.[67]

In Job 16:7 *'ᵃḏāṯî* is not to be emended to *rā'ᵃṯî*. V. 7b + *wattiqmᵉṭēnî* addresses Eliphaz: "You silence my witness and accuse me"; v. 8: "my suffering has risen up against me as a witness and testifies to my face."[68] Hence once again *'ēḏâ* and *'ēḏ* are juxtaposed. Job's own discourses are the witness that has been weakened by his friends' incisive argumentation; if his pain finds no justification in the theological explanation, it changes into a witness for the prosecution against Job's entire life.

III. *'wd* Hiphil/Hophal. The use of *'wd* hiphil encompasses two larger semantic fields.

1. *Hiphil in Connection with 'ēḏ.* As a denominative verb of *'ēḏ, 'wd* hiphil appears in either a juridical context (inside or outside a court setting) or a religious context in which a court situation is imitated. It reflects on the one hand the summoning or presentation of witnesses, and on the other hand their activities as such or in actually testifying. In Isa. 8:2; Jer. 32:10,25,44, *'wd* takes *'ēḏîm* as its direct object and must be understood as "summoning/appointing witnesses," which includes the activity or possibility of testifying. In neither instance does Yahweh's order include the securing of witnesses, though Jer. 32:25 does ascribe this to Yahweh despite the presence of "all the Judeans who were sitting in the court of the guard" (v. 12), which would have sufficed as testimony.

1 K. 21:1-16, the Naboth novella, presents precise details about the procedures involved in a certain type of legal assembly.[69] An atonement assembly is convened to conduct a fast, thus preparing for the appearance of the two witnesses. If one can discover the sin that has plunged the people into such distress, one can punish the guilty party and thus eliminate the unfavorable situation. The people are thus willing to ac-

---

67. Cf. E. T. Mullen Jr., "The Divine Witness and the Davidic Royal Grant: Ps 89:37-38," *JBL* 102 (1983) 207-18, with references to relevant Ugaritic texts.

68. Cf. L. Alonso Schökel and J. L. Sicre Díaz, *Job: Commentario teológico y literario* (Madrid, 1983), 248, 250.

69. Cf. E. Würthwein, "Naboth-Novelle und Elia-Wort," *ZTK* 75 (1978) 375-97.

cept any and all witnesses who can release them from responsibility. Vv. 10 and 13 distinguish between the choice of two false witnesses *(wᵉhôšîḇû šᵉnayim ʾᵃnāšîm bᵉnê-ḇᵉlîyaʿal)* and the act of testifying in person *(wayᵉʿiḏuhû* [*ʾeṯ* X *negeḏ* Y] *lēʾmōr:* "testify, bring a charge against someone [X] in the presence of someone [Y]"). The testimony of two witnesses is irrefutable. Because court proceedings in the OT take the interested party him- or herself or the family of that party as the point of departure, the testimony of witnesses as accusation functions as a means of the common defense of both law and institution and is thus welcome. This is why the *praesumptio* always stands in favor of the witnesses for the prosecution. The same meaning of "testify, give proof" (by way of exception on behalf of a person), is also found in the wistful monologue in Job 29:11.

The formula *ʿwd* hiphil *bᵉ* X *ʾeṯ-haššāmayim wᵉʾeṯ-hāʾāreṣ* ("call/present heaven and earth to witness against X") occurs in Dt. 4:26; 30:19; 31:28, in the first two instances within the context of imprecations against Israel for disloyalty against their covenant with Yahweh (cf. 32:23). If 32:45ff. continues 31:28-29, and "words" refers not to Moses' song but to the laws, then the formula (paralleling the placing of the book of the law near the ark of the covenant "as a witness," 31:26) helps underscore the proclamation of the laws (31:28b). The formula seems to be inspired by the mention of deities and natural elements, which in Hittite and Aramaic contracts are summoned as judges,[70] though here their function is clearly different. In Deuteronomy heaven and earth are witnesses for Moses' certainty regarding the punishment Yahweh has determined for breach of the covenant (4:26; 30:19) or for future transgressions against the law (31:28). The sense of the expression is that "as certain as heaven and earth exist, just as certain. . . ."

Heaven and earth are also summoned as witnesses (without mention of *ʿēḏ*) in Yahweh's oracles appearing in the prophetic discourses of judgment (e.g., Isa. 1:2ff.), where they guarantee the absolute certainty of imminent punishment. In Mal. 2:14 *ʿwd* hiphil refers to Yahweh as the witness between *(bên)* Judah and the wife of his youth, concretely between the Judeans, probably inhabitants of Jerusalem (cf. v. 11), and the legitimate wives who were protected by marital contracts *(ʾēšeṯ bᵉrîṯeḵā)*.[71] Because Yahweh was a "witness" to this "covenant," disloyalty toward the latter is also disloyalty toward Yahweh himself. The choice of terminology here may very well have been dictated by the importance attaching to the theme of the covenant in Mal. 1:1-3–3:12.[72]

The expression *wᵉʾāʿîḏâ bāḵ* in Ps. 50:7 can be understood as a denominative: "I will testify against you," i.e., "I accuse you." Indeed, vv. 1-7 do suggest a court setting in summoning heaven and earth (as witnesses? vv. 1,4) to judge *(lāḏîn)* his people (v. 4) in the presence of his faithful ones. Yahweh is judge (v. 6) and simultaneously also witness for the prosecution (v. 7). The mention of *bᵉrîṯ* in vv. 5 and 16 does not justify

70. Delcor, 11-14.

71. F. Horst, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. HAT* I/14 (²1954), 268; R. Althann, "Malachy 2,13-14 and UT 126,12-13," *Bibl* 58 (1977) 418-21.

72. Cf. S. L. McKenzie and H. N. Wallace, "Covenant Themes in Malachi," *CBQ* 45 (1983) 549-63.

translating v. 7 as "presenting covenantal regulations." This is not a presentation of conditions for the covenant but a juridical accusation of having transgressed against them.

2. *Hiphil in Connection with 'ēḏûṯ/'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ.* The second semantic field of *'wd* hiphil is tied to its use with *'ēḏûṯ/'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ.* This is still often translated as "witness, attest, testify," or something similar, though this involves the use of neutral expressions with no connection to the context. Although the translation "point out, refer," might fit in most cases, its semantic imprecision does not express the verb's nuances in every instance. All the texts in this group involve a figure of authority (Yahweh, a prophet, or a public authority) who announces authoritatively a standard or a law in order to prompt compliance with it. Depending on the supposed inclination of the recipient to accept or not accept the message, and on the content of the message itself (commandment, prohibition), translations can include:

a. *Order, command.* Someone authoritatively announces a norm that must be followed, with no reference to the inclination of the listeners. Whereas "order" refers to the content of the commandment, "announce, proclaim" focuses on the laws as a corpus.

b. *Forbid.* Someone authoritatively announces a prohibition without referring to the inclination of the listeners.

c. *Admonish.* Someone authoritatively announces — invokes — a law, obedience to which will be difficult for the listeners and in whose fulfillment the legislator has a special interest.

d. *Threaten.* Someone authoritatively announces a law and stipulates punishment for transgressing against it.

e. *Reproach.* Someone authoritatively announces once again an already familiar norm that the listeners have not followed.

The basis for these translations is the etymological and semantic relationships obtaining between *'wd* and *'ēḏûṯ*[73] and evident in the *figura etymologica* in 2 K. 17:15; Neh. 9:34 (see below). Various texts in this group frequently and clearly contain legal vocabulary while not really alluding to any juridical trial or procedure. Although the term *bᵉrîṯ* is explicitly mentioned in the immediate vicinity of Dt. 8:19 (v. 18) and Jer. 11:7 (vv. 2,3,6,8), apparently not all these texts have a connection with covenantal or contractual terminology. With the exception of Jer. 6:10, all these texts construe *'wd* hiphil with *bᵉ* to refer to the person toward whom the action is directed.

a. In Ex. 19:23 Moses repeats in a positive formulation Yahweh's prohibition (v. 21) against climbing the mountain: "You yourself ordered us to set limits around the mountain." In 1 S. 8:9 the direct object of *'wd* hiphil is *mišpaṭ hammeleḵ,* "laws/ways of the king." The expression *hā'ēḏ tā'îḏ bāhem wᵉhiggaḏtā lāhem* must be understood as a hendiadys: "Proclaim and teach them the laws of the king."

After concluding his song, Moses invites the people to observe all these words, *'ªšer*

73. Cf. I.1 and III.1.

'ānōkî m^e'îd bākem, "with which I authoritatively admonish you" (Dt. 32:46). In his own discourse, Nehemiah's argumentation (Neh. 9) juxtaposes Yahweh's loyalty to his covenant (v. 32) over against the disloyalty "of our kings" and officials. In the context of official disloyalty toward the torah and the commandments *(miṣwôṯ),* the phrase *'ēḏ^ewōṯeykā 'ašer ha'îḏôṯā bāhem* (v. 34) is to be translated as "your covenantal conditions that you imposed on them,"[74] and not understood as a mere allusion to "warnings." Similarly, the Deuteronomistic reflections on the fall of the northern kingdom (2 K. 17:7-18) summarize the sin of discarding the statutes *(ḥuqqāyw),* then refer to the covenant *(b^erîṯô)* made with "their ancestors," *w^e'ēṯ 'ēḏ^ewōṯāyw 'ašer hē'îḏ bām* (v. 15), here, too, suggesting the translation "and his covenantal conditions, which he imposed on them."

b. "Forbid" (the negative equivalent of "order") is the meaning in Yahweh's commandment to the people as mediated by Moses: "Go down and forbid the people lest *(pen)* they break through to Yahweh to look at him" (Ex. 19:21); similarly also in Jer. 42:19: "Do not go to Egypt. Be well aware that I have forbidden it to you today."

c. "Admonish" is the most frequent meaning in this group. Yahweh himself admonishes (Neh. 9:29; Ps. 81:9[8]; Jer. 6:10; 11:7; 42:19), or does so through the prophets (2 K. 17:13; 2 Ch. 24:19; Neh. 9:26,30), through his "spirit" (Neh. 9:30), or through his "messenger, angel" (Zec. 3:6). He warns Israel (Ps. 81:9[8]), Judah (2 K. 17:13; 2 Ch. 24:19), the generation that entered the promised land (Neh. 9), the high priest Joshua (Zec. 3:6), and the house of Jacob (Am. 3:13). He warns all these parties to return to him (2 Ch. 24:19; Neh. 9:26) or to his law (Neh. 9:29); to keep the commandments, statutes, and the entire law (2 K. 17:13); to walk in his ways and to follow his laws (Zec. 3:6); and to heed his voice (Ps. 81:9,12[8,11]; Jer. 11:7), meaning essentially "heed the words of the covenant" (cf. Jer. 11:2,3,6,8). Wisdom "admonishes" and instructs (*lmd* piel) all who respect her (Sir. 4:11; LXX *epilambánetai* refers to the reward mentioned in what follows). A degree of uncertainty remains in Jer. 6:12 regarding the addressee of the admonishment (prep. *'al* instead of *b^e*) and in Am. 3:13 regarding its subject.

d. Joseph warns his brothers not to return to him without Benjamin (Gen. 43:3). Moses threatens the people with total disaster if they are disloyal (Dt. 8:19). Although this formally constitutes a threat, it is difficult to use the verb "threaten" in our modern languages in the present sense (e.g., "I threaten you today that . . ."). Hence one might translate the expression *ha'îḏôṯî bākem hayyôm* as "You can be certain today that . . ." (NRSV "I solemnly warn you today that . . ."). The problem disappears in an account of the threat, e.g., "the man threatened us . . ." (Gen. 43:3), or in a recollection of it: Solomon reminds Shimei, "Did I not . . . threaten you?" (1 K. 2:42); and Nehemiah tells how he threatened to "lay hands on" the merchants from Tyre if they did not stop selling their goods on the sabbath (Neh. 13:21).

e. The same Nehemiah had previously "reproached" the merchants for not respecting the sabbath rest (Neh. 13:15). The expression using *'wd* hiphil finds a parallel in v. 17 in *rîḇ,* "remonstrate with, reproach."

---

74. Veijola, 349.

The expression *mâ-'a'îdēk . . . lāk* in Lam. 2:13 does not seem to fit any of the suggested semantic groups for *'wd* hiphil. The meaning suggested by H.-J. Kraus, "coax, encourage," based on the alleged "basic" meaning of *'wd* as "to repeat words continually," encounters etymological difficulties.[75] The parallel with *'adammeh* suggests an emendation to *'e'erōk*.

3. *Hophal.* In Ex. 21:29 *'wd* hophal (as a passive form of the hiphil) has a meaning similar to "proclaim/announce a law,"[76] and is restricted to the private sphere. The sense is "if one has notified" the owner of an errant ox, or "if one has called this to his attention."

IV. Other Nominal Forms.

1. *'ēdût.* a. The term *'ēdût* appears (outside legal contexts) particularly in the Pentateuch, and there especially in constructions as the *nomen regens.* The expression *lûḥōt hā'ēdût* appears in Ex. 31:18; 32:15; 34:29, Priestly addenda to the narrative of the golden calf, a narrative of considerable complexity from both the literary-critical and traditio-historical perspective (31:18–34:35).[77] An identification of the *lûḥōt 'ēdût* with the stone tablets (31:18; 34:1,4), with the "two tablets" (31:18; 34:1,4,29), or with "the tablets" (32:19; 34:1,28) requires that one understand *'ēdût* as a written document kept in a chest. This makes it possible to speak of *'arôn hā'ēdût* in texts that describe the *miškān,* its dedication, or the tasks of the Levites (25:22; 26:33,34; 30:6,26; 31:7; 39:35; 40:3,5,21; Nu. 4:5; 7:89); the expression in Josh. 4:16 probably represents Priestly redaction. Nu. 9:15 identifies the *'ōhel hā'ēdût* (the location of the *'arôn hā'ēdût)* with the *miškān,* and 18:2 juxtaposes it with the *miqdāš.* The story of Aaron's staff mentions it (Nu. 17:22f.; note in vv. 19,25 that *'ēdût* refers to the *'arôn hā'ēdût*), as does 2 Ch. 24:6 (concerning dues for the sanctuary). In Ex. 38:21 the expression *miškan hā'ēdût* defines the term *miškān* more precisely. Nu. 1:50 and 53 describe the tasks of the Levites with regard to the *miškan hā'ēdut,* and Nu. 10:11 the lifting of the cloud from the dwelling place of the law.

Moses is ordered to put *(nāṯan)* the *'ēdût* in the *'arôn* (Ex. 25:16,21), and does so (40:20). Ex. 27:21 (par. Lev. 24:3) and Ex. 30:6 recount that a lamp and incense altar stood directly before the curtain concealing the *'ēdût.* By contrast, other texts say that manna (Ex. 16:34) and incense (30:36) are located in front of the *'ēdût.* According to Ex. 30:6 and Lev. 16:13, the mercy seat *(kappōreṯ)* was over the *'ēdût.*[78] All these texts, which are generally attributed to P, seem to be concerned in a systematic fashion with using the term *'ēdût* where the Deuteronomic-Deuteronomistic tradition would have used *berîṯ* (*lûḥōṯ habberîṯ,* Dt. 9:9,11; *'arôn berîṯ YHWH,* Dt. 10:8; Nu. 10:33).[79] The

---

75. Cf. I.1; H.-J. Kraus, *Klagelieder (Threni). BK* XX (⁴1983), 36, 38.
76. Cf. III.2.a.
77. → לוח *lûaḥ* (VII, 480-83). Cf. C. Dohmen, *Das Bilderverbot: Seine Entstehung und seine Entwicklung im AT. BBB* 62 (1985); → סיני *sînay.*
78. → VII, 298.
79. → ברית *berîṯ (berîth)* (II, 253-79).

assumption seems justified that this terminology was intended to underscore both the character of covenantal regulations[80] that in reality the laws are supposed to have, as well as their character as testimony or witness (given the connection between *'ēḏûṯ* and *'ēḏ*, at least in popular etymology). The covenantal conditions are a witness to Yahweh's loyalty to his covenant as well as a witness against potential disloyalty on Israel's part.

b. *2 K. 11:12.* The meaning of *'ēḏûṯ* in 2 K. 11:12 par. 2 Ch. 23:11 is hotly disputed. The priest Jehoiada crowns Joash king by giving him the *'ēḏûṯ* and *nēzer* (the diadem). G. von Rad abandons the less plausible suggestion of emending the MT into *haṣṣᵉʿāḏôṯ*, "bracelet, arm bangle," as a parallel to 2 S. 1:10, and understands *'ēḏûṯ* as part of royal protocol, comparing it with Egyp. *nḫb.t* and equating it with *ḥōq* in Ps. 2:7.[81] In his view the two terms document the legitimation of the king as a ruler in the commission of the deity. The Egyptologist K. A. Kitchen, however, rejects this identification, and others have suggested understanding *'ēḏûṯ* in the same sense as P (?) as a legislative document (summary of the law, including even the "tables of the law" themselves), as a symbol of the covenant, or as a document encompassing the main points of Yahweh's covenant with the house of David.[82] S. Yeivin suggests the rendering "ornamented head cover, wrought from precious material, and fashioned in the shape of a winged and tailed sun disk."[83] In all probability the reference is to some sort of written document.

c. *Psalms.* The sg. of *'ēḏûṯ* appears in psalms from the wisdom tradition. In Ps. 19:8(7) it parallels *tôrâ* and refers to the totality of Yahweh's ordinances (cf. v. 9[8], *piqqûḏîm* and *miṣwâ*), while in 78:5 it refers to the stipulation that commandments of the past be transmitted to following generations (vv. 2,5-6). In 81:6(5) (par. to *ḥōq* and *mišpāṭ*) and 122:4, *'ēḏûṯ* is merely saying something about the liturgical regulations for an unidentified festival or for the pilgrimage to Jerusalem (the translation "instruction" seems to fit all 4 texts).

The singular occurrence of *'ēḏûṯ* in 119:88 suggests taking it as the pl. *'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ* (22 occurrences), as do Qumran, LXX, and Vulg. It is still uncertain whether the meaning of the superscriptions *'al-šûšan 'ēḏûṯ* (60:1[superscription]) and *'el-šôšannîm 'ēḏûṯ* (80:1[superscription]) are to be understood in the same sense ("According to Lily/Lilies, a Testimony," or "Lily of Testimony"?). The first version, "After/According to Lily," would refer to a melody; "a testimony" might refer to a *genus litterarium*.

d. Twice in Sirach *'ēḏûṯ* means "testimony." The praise of the people is a testimony

---

80. Cf. I.1.

81. A. R. Johnson, *Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff, ²1967), 23-25; Dhorme, *La Bible. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade* (Paris, 1956f.).

82. See, respectively, Kitchen, *Ancient Orient and OT* (London, 1966), 107; G. Widengren, *Sakrales Königtum im AT und im Judentum* (Stuttgart, 1955), 29; Falk, *Hebrew Law;* Johnson, *Sacral Kingship,* 23-25.

83. "'Ēdūth," *IEJ* 24 (1974) 17-20.

for the largessse of the generous one (31[34]:23). Yahweh is asked to "bear witness" to his works "of the beginning" (33[36]:20).

2. *'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ.* a. *Series.* The pl. form *'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ* appears only in legal texts of Deuteronomy and in texts exhibiting Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic influence. Outside the Psalms it occurs generally in a three-part sequence: with *ḥuqqîm* and *mišpāṭîm* (Dt. 4:45; 6:20); between *miṣwôṯ* and *ḥuqqîm* (Dt. 6:17; 1 Ch. 29:19; 2 Ch. 34:31); after *ḥuqqôṯ, miṣwôṯ,* and *mišpāṭîm* (1 K. 2:3, four-part series); after *ḥuqqîm* and *bᵉrîṯ* (2 K. 17:15);[84] with *bᵉrîṯ, miṣwôṯ,* and *ḥuqqôṯ* (2 K. 23:3, four-part series); after *tôrâ* and *miṣwôṯ* (Neh. 9:34); and after *tôrâ* and *ḥuqqôṯ* (Jer. 44:23); cf. also Sir. 45:4. In Ps. 25:10 and 132:12 it parallels *bᵉrîṯ,* and in 99:7 it parallels *ḥōq.* It occurs alone in 78:56 and 93:5. In texts from Deuteronomy *'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ* probably refers to the entire "law," the parenetic part along with the legal corpus.[85]

In Deuteronomy the expression *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* is said to be synonymous with *'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ* and of later provenance in the process of textual expansion.[86] In any event, "both Deuteronomy and Chronicles use this expression now only as a fixed formula."[87] The term *miṣwôṯ,* at least in Dt. 5:10,29; 6:17; 7:9; 8:2; 13:5(4), seems to be reserved for the Decalog commandments.[88] An exact determination of its meaning is hindered by the fluid, interchangeable meaning of such terms in many passages in Deuteronomy and Deuteronomistic literature, and by the fact that *'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ* (like *mišmereṯ, 'ēmer, 'imrâ, piqqûḏîm*) has no technical meaning as a reference to any legal genres.[89] Hence in general the term *'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ* refers to legal statutes, and in immediate proximity to *bᵉrîṯ* probably to "covenantal regulations"[90] (though cf. 2 K. 23:3, where after *'ēḏôṯ* an explicit reference is made to *diḇrê-habbᵉrîṯ*). With the exception of Dt. 4:45 (*'ēḏôṯ . . . 'ᵃšer dibber mōšeh*), all remaining occurrences refer to Yahweh's "commandments" or *'ᵃšer ṣiwwâ YHWH* (Dt. 6:17). The expressions containing *'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ* appear in general (Dt. 6:17) or specific admonitions (1 K. 2:3), in discourses (1 Ch. 29:19), in decisions (2 K. 23:3 par. 2 Ch. 34:31), accusations (Jer. 44:23), observations (Ps. 78:56; 99:7), or promises (Ps. 132:12) associated with the adherence to (*šāmar*) or rejection of (*mā'as,* 2 K. 17:15; cf. *hiqšîḇ 'el,* Neh. 9:34; *hālaḵ bᵉ,* Jer. 44:23) such "commandments" or "decrees."

b. *Ps. 119.* The term *'ēḏ(ᵉw)ôṯ* occurs 23 times in Ps. 119, including the presumed emendation in v. 88 (MT *'ēḏûṯ*), alternating with seven other lexemes drawn from "legal" vocabulary (*tôrâ, mišpāṭîm, piqquḏîm, ḥuqqîm, miṣwôṯ, 'imrâ, dᵉḇārîm*), each of which appears between 19 and 25 times. One hypothesis is that eight originally independent texts, each of which focused on one of these terms, were then assembled

84. Cf. III.2.a.
85. Braulik, 64.
86. Merendino, 207.
87. Liedke, 185.
88. Braulik, 60; cf. Liedke, 194.
89. For the first, → חקק *ḥāqaq,* V, 142f., 145. For the second see Liedke, 17 n. 3.
90. Cf. III.2.a.

(badly) into a single composition.[91] Perhaps a better suggestion is to understand the psalm as praise of God's word (rather than of only the law). Of the terms mentioned, perhaps only three do not transcend the legal sphere as such *(ḥōq, 'ēḏûṯ, piqqûḏ),* while the others, though certainly sometimes used in the legal sense, occur more frequently with a more comprehensive meaning, e.g., as Yahweh's promise, his word, his revelation, or his decisions, and on the way all these intervene in the concrete history of the world and of human beings. The term *tôrâ,* which occurs quite frequently and summarizes the meaning of the others, is also laden with secondary meanings derived from Deuteronomic, prophetic, and wisdom thinking underscoring the fundamental character of the ethical-religious demands of the "law."

3. *tᵉ'ûḏâ.* In Ruth 4:7 the author identifies and explicates the ancient custom of taking off and giving one's sandals to someone else as *tᵉ'ûḏâ,* a symbol of transference of property or of a purchase contract.[92] The *tᵉ'ûḏâ,* "testimony, attestation," in Isa. 8:16,20 is clearly a written document probably containing all the prophet's actions and words from chs. 7 and 8. Isaiah demands that these two chapters be preserved in a written and sealed form because they contain a summary of the prophet's entire message. The parallel with *tôrâ,* "instruction, teaching" (commensurate with the prophet's frequent use of the term → תורה *tôrâ*) refers to the unity of message and decision, proclamation and commandment, and in an even broader sense to the relationship with Yahweh's word (cf. 1:10; 2:3; 5:24; 30:9). Isa. 8:20 admonishes its readers to return to Yahweh's word and to abandon any other occult means of discerning his ways.[93]

Simian-Yofre

V. Qumran. Most of the occurrences of *'ēḏ* in Qumran exhibit a juridical meaning. The errant community brother is to be admonished "in the presence of witnesses" (1QS 6:1; CD 9:3). In matters of property crimes, two trustworthy *(ne'ᵉmān)* witnesses are required (CD 9:23), and witnesses participating in trials of capital crimes require special qualifications (10:1; read *'yd* instead of *'wd*). A transgressor is unacceptable as a trustworthy witness (10:3). The term occurs 4 times in the Temple Scroll (61:6,7[bis], 9) in a citation from Dt. 19:15-21, and twice more in the law on crucifixion (11QT 64:8) with a citation from Dt. 17:6 ("two or three witnesses"). The word has an extended meaning in 1QS 8:5f.; the community is "an everlasting plantation, a house of holiness for Israel, a *sôḏ* of supreme holiness for Aaron, and witnesses to the truth at the judgment."

The verb *hē'îḏ* occurs once in a sentence concerned with "inculcating" the legal regulations of the *tôrâ* (1QSa 1:11); peculiarly, a woman does this over against her husband. In CD 9:20 *hē'îḏ* means to "give testimony, testify," in the juridical sense. CD

91. Cf. S. Bergler, "Der längste Psalm — Anthologie oder Liturgie?" *VT* 29 (1979) 257-88.
92. → נעל *na'al* (IX, 465-67).
93. Cf. J. Jensen, *The Use of* tôrâ *by Isaiah: His Debate with the Wisdom Tradition. CBQMS* 3 (1973), 110-12.

19:30 speaks of the ancestors whom God loved and who "testified against the people concerning him" (*hē'îḏû;* ms. A 8:17 reads *hô'îrû*).

The form *'ēḏûṯ* occurs 3 times. In 1Q22 2:1 Israel is charged with keeping the laws, "testimonies," and commandments. CD 3:15 refers to "the testimonies of his righteousness" par. "the ways of his truth," i.e., his righteous ordinances and his true ways. CD 20:31 refers to "his holy statutes *(ḥōq),* his righteous ordinances *(mišpāṭ),* and his true *'ēḏᵉwôṯ.*"

The form *tᵉ'ûḏâ* undergoes a particular semantic development. It occurs several times in the combination *mô'ᵃḏê tᵉ'ûḏôṯ* (1QS 1:9; 3:10; 1QM 14:13; 4QMᵃ 11), and like *mô'ēḏ* derives apparently from *yā'aḏ,* "arrange, appoint a time," referring thus to "the divine predetermination."[94] One can thus say "when they [humans] come into being according to their *tᵉ'ûḏôṯ,* they accomplish their task" (1QH 3:16); or "in the wisdom of your knowledge, you established their *tᵉ'ûḏôṯ* before ever they were" (1:19); or "and if there is a *tᵉ'ûḏâ* for something that is to happen, then it happens" (12:9). So also is the community to extol and praise God at the times appointed from eternity *(mô'ᵃḏê tᵉ'ûḏôṯ 'ôlāmîm)* in the evening and in the morning (1QM 14:13f.). Commensurate with this, the anointed prophets are the "seers of the preappointed events *(ḥôzê tᵉ'ûḏôṯ)*" (1QM 11:8). The expression *qēṣ tᵉ'ûḏâ* (1QH fr. 5:11; 59:3) probably also belongs in this context, since in Qumran the term *qēṣ* refers to a previously appointed time. According to 1QM 13:8, the *"tᵉ'ûḏôṯ* of your glory *(kāḇôḏ)"* together with *zkr* is a sign of God's presence among his people. The expression *tᵉ'ûḏaṯ yᵉšû'â* (14:4) possibly means something like "announcement, proclamation." The expression *tᵉ'ûḏôṯ milḥāmâ* in 1QM 2:8 might refer to a solemn declaration of war (as is doubtless the case in 1QSa 1:26, since the same word in the preceding line apparently refers to an announcement to the entire community).[95] If as in 1QH 2:37 *tᵉ'ûḏôṯ* is associated with *ḥuqqîm,* the meaning "proclamation, declaration," seems even more likely, and one might even equate it with *'ēḏᵉwôṯ* in the sense of "ordinances, stipulations of the law." Similarly, the *niṣmᵉḏê tᵉ'ûḏāṯî* (1QH 6:19) are probably those who accepted (adopted) the proclamation of the teacher but then allowed themselves to be lured away. It is unclear why the nine congregations under the command of the chief are called "men of his *tᵉ'ûḏâ*" (1QM 4:5). 1Q36 12, containing the expression *tᵉ'ûḏaṯ šālôm,* is too corrupt to permit any translation.

Ringgren

---

94. Cf. H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran* (Philadelphia, 1963), 53f.
95. D. Barthélemy, *DJD,* I, 116, translates "convocation."

עוז *'wz*

Etymologically, Heb. *'wz* corresponds to Arab. *'āḏa(w),* "seek refuge" (e.g., in the familiar formula *'a'ūḏu billāhi,* "I take refuge with God"); cf. also *ma'āḏ,* "(place of) refuge." The root also occurs in Nabatean, Liḥyanite, Thamudic, Safaitic, and Old South Arabic personal names.[1]

In Hebrew the root occurs twice in the qal (both times in the impf. *ya'ōz* constructed after the analogy of *'zz*) and 4 times in the hiphil. The qal means "take refuge, find shelter," and in Isa. 30:2 it parallels → חסה *ḥāsâ.* Judah seeks refuge and shelter in Egypt without asking Yahweh first, an act that can only bring shame and humiliation. Here *'wz* is used with *mā'ôz* in a *figura etymologica.* Ps. 52:9(Eng. v. 7) speaks of a man who, rather than taking God as his refuge *(mā'ôz),* trusted in riches *(bāṭaḥ)* and sought refuge (*'wz;* or does *yā'ōz* derive from *'zz,* "be strong"?) in wickedness (*hawwâ;* or should one read *hônô,* "his wealth," with Syr., Targ.?).

The hiphil means "bring to refuge, shelter," and in Ex. 9:19 takes *miqneh,* "cattle," as its object. In 3 other passages the hiphil is used absolutely with the meaning "bring oneself/one's property to shelter," and all 3 passages involve hostile threats. Isa. 10:31 describes the Assyrian advance against Jerusalem during which city after city is taken. Jer. 4:6 and 6:1 use the term in connection with the enemy from the north.

Both occurrences of the qal are associated with *mā'ôz.* Although at first glance *mā'ôz* might derive from *'wz* and mean "(place of) refuge," the suffix forms with double *z* suggest deriving it instead from *'zz.* In all likelihood, two originally independent derivations have coalesced here, and since in actual usage they cannot be distinguished semantically,[2] *mā'ôz* is treated under → עזז *'zz.*

Ringgren

'wz. Y. Avishur, "Biblical Words and Phrases in the Light of Their Akkadian Parallels," *ShnatMiqr* 2 (1977) 11-19; P. Hugger, *Jahwe meine Zuflucht. MüSt* 13 (1971), esp. 91; G. Rinaldi, *"Reqîa' 'ōz," BeO* 25 (1983) 104; → עזז.

1. W. W. Müller, *Die Wurzeln mediae und tertiae y/w im Altsüdarabischen* (diss., Tübingen, 1962), 82.

2. *HAL,* II, 610.

עול *'wl*; עוּל *'ûl*; עֲוִיל *'ᵃwîl*; עוֹלֵל/עוֹלָל *'ôlēl/'ôlāl*

Contents: I. Root and Distribution. II. 1. OT Forms and Occurrences; 2. Parallel Terms. III. General Use: 1. *'wl* II; 2. *'ûl;* 3. *'ᵃwîl;* 4. *'ôlēl/'ôlāl.* IV. Theological Aspects. V. Qumran and LXX.

I. Root and Distribution. The root *'wl* seems to be attested throughout the Semitic sphere (cf., e.g., Arab. *'wl,* "feed, nurture"; Akk. *ulaltu* does not belong in this context[1]), though it is attested with particular frequency in (North) West Semitic. Forms are often abbreviated such that the medial *w* (or *y*) is not evident, as in Ugar. *'l,* "child"; Old Aram. *'l,* "child"; or Pun. *'l,* "infant, nursling."[2] As already indicated, the medial *w* can occasionally alternate with medial *y* (cf. Arab. *'ayyil,* "small child"; and see above; also *Syr. 'îlā',* "foaling," next to *'awlā',* "suckling, small child"; cf. also *Sam. 'ylws*).[3] The basic meaning is probably "suckle," though among the most frequently occurring nouns this meaning has been weakened in varying degrees.

II. 1. *OT Forms and Occurrences.* In the OT the verb *'wl* II occurs 5 times, and only as the qal fem. pl. ptcp. *'ālôṯ* (Gen. 33:13; 1 S. 6:7,10; Ps. 78:71; Isa. 40:11). Among

---

'wl. 1. General: G. Bertram, "νήπιος κτλ.," *TDNT,* IV, 912-23, esp. 914-17.

2. On specific aspects: R. Degen, *Altaramäische Grammatik der Inschriften des 10.-8. Jahrhunderts v.Chr. AKM* 38/3 (1969), 45; J. Hoftijzer and G. van der Kooij, *Aramaic Texts from Deir 'Alla. DMOA* 19 (1976), 239; W. W. Müller, *Die Wurzeln mediae und tertiae y/w im Altsüdarabischen* (diss., Tübingen, 1962); → ינק *yānaq.*

3. On Ps. 8:3(Eng. v. 2): W. Beyerlin, "Psalm 8: Chancen der Überlieferungskritik," *ZTK* 73 (1976) 1-22; M. J. Dahood, "Northwest Semitic Texts and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible," *Questions disputées de l'AT. BETL* 33 (1974), 11-37, esp. 27; H. Donner, "Ugaritismen in der Psalmenforschung," *ZAW* 79 (1967) 322-50, esp. 324-27; V. Hamp, "Ps 8,2b,3," *BZ* 16 (1972) 115-20; J. Hempel, *Mensch und König: Studien zu Psalm 8 und Hiob. FuF* 35 (1961), 119-23; J. Leveen, "Textual Problems in the Psalms," *VT* 21 (1971) 48-58, esp. 48f.; O. Loretz, "Psalmenstudien: II. Poetischer Aufbau von Psalm 8," *UF* 3 (1971) 104-12; H. Graf Reventlow, "Der Psalm 8," *Poetica* 1 (1967) 304-32; H. Ringgren, "Psalm 8 och kristologin," *SEÅ* 37/38 (1972/73) 16-20; W. Rudolph, "'Aus dem Munde der jungen Kinder und Säuglinge . . .' (Psalm 8,3)," *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. FS W. Zimmerli* (Göttingen, 1977), 388-96; J. J. Stamm, "Eine Bemerkung zum Anfang des achten Psalms," *TZ* 13 (1957) 470-78; R. Tournay, "Le Psaume VIII et la doctrine biblique du nom," *RB* 78 (1971) 18-30.

1. *AHw,* III, 1407; cf. otherwise *HAL,* II, 797.

2. For Ugaritic see *KTU,* 1.16 VI, 48; 1.19 IV, 40; cf. *CML²,* 154; *HAL* has here "young, nursing animal," with reference to *Ugaritica,* V, 551, no. 2, l. 9; M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sanmartín, "Der 'Neujahrspsalm' RS 24.252 (= UG.5, 5.551-557 NR.2)," *UF* 7 (1975) 115, 118; cf. otherwise *WUS,* no. 2028, and *UT,* no. 1853. For Old Aramaic see *DNSI,* II, 643, 844; cf. Sefire, *KAI,* 222, 22. For Punic see *KAI,* 61, 2; cf. 98, 2; 99, 2.

3. See *CSD,* s.v.; Z. Ben Ḥayyim, *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans,* 5 vols. (Jerusalem, 1957-77), II, 550; also *HAL,* II, 797.

the nouns, the forms *'ûl* and *'ᵃwîl* are rare and of late provenance. Hence *'ûl* occurs only twice (Isa. 49:15; 65:20), though Job 24:9 may possibly also be included through the conj. *'ul* for the prep. *'al,* whose presence in this passage is problematic.[4] The word *'ᵃwîl* has been identified as both an aramaizing form and as a loanword, and probably occurs 2 rather than 3 times.[5] In Job 16:11a considerations of both content and textual history militate against deriving the (homonymous) form *'ᵃwîl* from *'wl* II, and certainly not from yet another root *'wl,* for the sake of then emending it immediately to *'awwāl.*[6] One should probably understand it as a special form of *'āwal*,* "do wrong, perform an injustice."[7] Opinion has long been divided concerning the derivation of *'ôlēl/'ôlāl* as well.

Although some (primarily earlier) scholars derive these nouns from *'ll,* "be active,"[8] or from an otherwise unknown root *'ll* II,[9] most derive the nouns from *'wl* II according to a *qaṭīl* construction.[10] The form *mᵉ'ôlēl* in Isa. 3:12 is particularly disputed, and though occasionally associated with *'ôlēl,* "child," it can be explained otherwise and need not be considered here.[11]

Accounting for 20 of the 30 occurrences of the root *'wl* II (including *'ô/ōlēl* 11 times and *'ôlāl* 9 times), these nouns dominate the profile of this word group.

2. *Parallel Terms.* Several parallel terms alternate with the various nouns of this group and can thus throw light on both the use and the meaning of the latter.[12] The par. *ben-biṭnâ,* "son of her womb," in Isa. 49:15,[13] and the association with *yāmîm,* "days," in Isa. 65:20, i.e., "an infant [only a few] days [old]," show clearly that *'ûl* refers to a newborn or extremely small child, a nursing infant (cf. also Job 24:9). By contrast, *'ᵃwîlîm* parallels *yᵉlāḏîm* in Job 21:11, and probably refers to "children" in a general sense (cf. also 19:18). The most frequently occurring parallel word to *'ôlēl/'ôlāl* is *yônēq,* "suckling,"[14] which occurs 7 times in this context (1 S. 15:3; 22:19; Ps. 8:3[2]; Jer. 44:7; Lam. 2:11; 4:4; Joel 2:16), though in two instances the words are not directly parallel (1 S. 15:3; 22:19), occurring rather within the framework of a *min–'aḏ* formula. This shows that the content of the two words is not exactly equivalent.[15] Other

---

4. Cf., e.g., G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 368; otherwise *GesB,* 210a; *HAL,* I, 285; II, 798.

5. Cf. Meyer, II, §37.4; *BLe,* 471f.; *GesB,* s.v.; Lisowsky.

6. Cf. *GesB,* 570a; *BDB,* 732a; on emendation see, e.g., *BHK³; HAL,* II, 797.

7. Cf. the versions; Mandelkern, 833; *LexHebAram,* 578b.

8. Cf. *LexHebAram,* 579a, with reference to E. König.

9. Cf., e.g., B. Stade, *Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1879), §233; with some reservation also *BDB,* 760b.

10. Cf. Meyer, II, §39.1; *HAL,* II, 798; Mandelkern, 833; Lisowsky, 1031; *GesB* offers both views without choosing, 571a, 593a.

11. Cf. Mandelkern, 833; *GesB,* 593a; *HAL,* II, 834; cf. otherwise H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), in loc.

12. See III below.

13. Cf. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1969), in loc.

14. → ינק *ynq* (VI, 106-8).

15. See III.4.

parallel terms include *bānîm,* "sons" (Ps. 17:14), and *bahûrîm,* "young men" (Jer. 6:11; 9:20[21]); in this context, different groups are being juxtaposed.[16]

III. General Use. Although the above considerations concerning parallel terms have already shed some light on the use and meaning of this word group, we have not yet considered the verb.

1. *'wl.* The verb is used nominally. That is, the fem. ptcp. *'ālôṯ* refers first of all to nursing mother animals, including both large and small livestock (Gen. 33:13; 1 S. 6:7,10). This is most clearly the case in Ps. 78:71, where the participle stands alone (in connection with the election of David, it states that God "took him [David] from tending the nursing [mother] ewes," *mē'ahar 'ālôṯ h^e^bî'ô*). The participial form also stands alone in Isa. 40:11, though now used in a clearly figurative rather than literal sense, and in a context moreover that involves speaking about Israel as God's flock.[17]

2. *'ûl.* The noun *'ûl,* "nursing baby, suckling," is used only in late prophetic texts, occurring once in a consolation discourse (Isa. 49:15) and once in a discourse of promise (65:20). Although the use here is literal in and of itself, it does accommodate to what is partly a figurative theological context.[18]

3. *'^a^wîl.* The noun *'^a^wîl,* "boy," occurs only in Job, and there only in Job's discourses (19:18; 21:11), which use it literally in order to make his statements a bit more incisive, expressing the element of "even. . . ."

4. *'ôlēl/'ôlāl.* The nouns *'ôlēl* and *'ôlāl* are also used literally, and are often associated with *yônēq,* "suckling."[19] One construction is worthy of particular mention, that with the preps. *min,* "from," and *'aḏ,* "to," in 1 S. 15:3 and 22:19, where an enumeration reads: "from the small child to the suckling" *(mē'ôlēl w^e^'aḏ-yônēq),* after the verse has just enumerated "from the man to the woman" (and afterward mentions various animals). Such mention of closely related yet different groups expresses the comprehensive nature of a particular event; in this instance everyone, even down to the smallest child, is affected. The events associated with a great many of the occurrences of these nouns involve war, and the mention of the "small child" (or "small child and suckling," *'ôlēl w^e^yônēq)* seems to be a figure of speech favored by descriptions of war and disaster, one aiming to underscore the cruelty of war and the people's profound distress. In several instances these words are associated with verbs such as *rṭš,* "shatter" (piel, as obj. in 2 K. 8:12; with pual, as subj. in Isa. 13:16; Hos. 14:1[13:16]; Nah. 3:10), *'ṭp* II niphal, "languish" (Lam. 2:11), *hiḵrîṯ,* "eradicate" (as obj. in Jer. 9:20; 44:7),[20] or *npṣ* piel, "dash to pieces" (Ps. 137:9, as obj.) The last passage is part of a prayer for re-

16. → בן *bēn* (II, 145-59). See III.4 below.
17. See IV below.
18. See IV.
19. See II.2.
20. → כרת *krt* (VII, 339-52).

venge, as is also the case in Ps. 17:14. The remaining examples occur in a prophetic accusation (Mic. 2:9), a creation hymn (Ps. 8:3[2]), and a prophetic passage in which *'ôlāl* together with the contrasting *zeqēnîm,* "elders," constitutes an expression of completeness (Joel 2:16, with *'sp,* "gather").

IV. Theological Aspects. As the previous discussion shows, this word group is used almost exclusively in the literal sense. The same applies to its theological meaning, the exception being Isa. 40:11.[21] In that passage not only is the reference to the people in the collective sense as "flock" and, individualizing, as "lambs" and "ewes," but the metaphor also serves to emphasize the theological sense of the assertion that God will now take care of his people. Isa. 49:15 uses the noun *'ûl* in its literal sense in a theologically similar context (cf. also the salvific-eschatological context of the same noun in 65:20).

Most of the occurrences of the nouns *'ôlēl* and *'ôlāl* contrast the positive theological context of these particular passages. As already mentioned, they occur overwhelmingly in portrayals of war and profound distress.[22] It is probably of some theological significance that war or disaster is not without some connection to God, especially considering that some of these passages involve the fall of Jerusalem, the dominant theme in Lamentations (which has no fewer than 5 of the 20 occurrences of these nouns: 2:11,20 and 1:5; 2:19; 4:4; cf. also Jer. 9:20; 44:7). Neither these nor the other passages where *'ôlēl* or *'ôlāl* occurs have any particular interest in "small children" as such; their mention, especially mention of their death, is an expression of the total eradication of a population or people, which in its own turn can be an expression of the punishment of divine wrath (cf., e.g., 1 S. 15:3; Ps. 17:14; 137:9; Isa. 13:16; Hos. 14:1[13:16]; also Lam. 2:17,22). By contrast, the prayer for God's compassion in Lam. 2:19, "Lift your hands to him for the lives of your children," expresses hope in a change of fate and the restitution of the people on the basis of God's mercy alone.

Perhaps the difficult passage Ps. 8:3(2) may also be best understood from this perspective. Without addressing the manifold textual and exegetical problems attaching to this passage,[23] one can ask whether v. 3(2) is to be understood as a historically focused interruption of a psalm otherwise concerned with creation theology (if not vice versa, namely, that the verse represents the substantive center of a psalm around which a creation-theological grounding has been placed, similar to the way Deutero-Isaiah grounds his own message of salvation in part with creation-theological elements).[24]

In contrast to the enemies of the people, whose mouth is open wide for devouring (cf. Lam. 2:16; 3:46; also Ps. 22:14[13]; 35:21; Job 16:10), Israel's mighty creator God begins with the mouths of defenseless small children and sucklings in "building a bul-

---

21. See III.1.
22. See III.4.
23. See the bibliog. above, and → יָנַק *yānaq,* VI, 107f.
24. Cf. R. Rendtorff, "Die theologische Stellung des Schöpfungsglaubens bei Deuterojesaja," *ZTK* 51 (1954) 3-13 = *ThB* 57 (1975), 209-19.

wark" against such enemies for the sake of preparing both salvation and new life for his people.[25]

V. Qumran and LXX. This word group occurs only rarely in the Qumran writings. The noun *ʿûl* appears occasionally as a comparative element in theologically significant assertions of trust, as in 1QH 9:36 and probably also in 7:36 (and 7:21).[26]

The LXX uses a variety of terms in rendering this word group. Apart from 1 S. 6:7 and 10 (with *prōtotokéō*), the verb referring to pregnant animals is used (*locheúein,* Gen. 33:13; Ps. 78:71; and *en gastrí échein,* Isa. 40:11). It renders the noun *ʿûl* commensurately with *paidíon* (Isa. 49:15) and *áōros* (Isa. 65:20), while probably not understanding the noun *ʿᵃwîl* in the first place (Job 19:18; 21:11).[27] In 18 of its 20 occurrences, the LXX renders the terms *ʿôlēl* and *ʿôlāl* by a single word, including 16 times by *nḗpios,* otherwise by *téknon* (Isa. 13:16) and by the hapax legomenon *hypotítthion* (Hos. 14:1[13:16]). The most important word regarding this word group is thus *nḗpios.*[28] Among the remaining occurrences, the LXX integrates Ps. 8:3(2) more strongly into the context by rendering MT *ʿōz* ("bulwark") with *aínos,* "praise" (so also in Mt. 21:16).[29]

Sæbø

25. So H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 87f. I will publish elsewhere a more detailed discussion of this interpretation.

26. See E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, ²1971), 140, who reads *ʿôlēl* in this passage; cf. otherwise *HAL,* II, 797.

27. Cf. Bertram, 916.

28. See Bertram, 915f.

29. See previous discussion; cf. *HAL,* II, 805f.

עָוֶל *ʿāwel;* עַוְלָה *ʿawlâ;* עול *ʿwl;* עַוָּל *ʿiwwāl*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences. II. Meaning: 1. Word Field; 2. Basic Meaning; 3. Court Procedure; 4. Unjust Deeds; 5. Human Behavior at Large; 6. Revenge for Injustice. III. Yahweh and Injustice. IV. Qumran.

ʿāwel. E. Beaucamp, "Péché I, dans l'AT," *DBS,* VII (1966), 407-71; K. H. Fahlgren, *Ṣᵉdāḳā, nahestehende und entgegengesetzte Begriffe im AT* (Uppsala, 1932); A. Jepsen, "ṣdq und ṣdqh im AT," *Gottes Wort und Gottes Land. FS H. W. Hertzberg* (Göttingen, 1965), 78-89; R. Knierim, "עָוֶל *ʿāwel* perversity," *TLOT,* II, 849-51; idem, *Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde im AT* (Gütersloh, ²1967); K. Koch, "חָטָא *ḥāṭāʾ (chāṭāʾ),*" *TDOT,* IV, 309-19 (with bibliog.); idem,

I. 1. *Etymology.* This root is attested in Jewish Aramaic, Syriac, and Ethiopic (*'lw*), and is probably correctly associated with Arab. *'wl,* "depart from the right path." A derivation from *'wh,* "transgress" (Middle Hebrew, "act wrongly"; cf. Arab. *'wy,* "bend") with the nominal-constructive element *l* is unlikely.[1] The verb *'wl* piel derives from the noun *'āwel* and refers to the action of *'āwel,* similarly also *'iwwāl* as *nomen agentis. GesB* and *HAL* translate *'āwel* as "perversity, injustice, badness, malice"; *'wl* piel as "to act unjustly, to spoil, act treacherously, rebel"; and *'iwwāl* as "criminal, sinner, unjust person, mean person." The LXX usually translates with *adikía(-kēma,* Ezk. 28:15) or *ádikos,* then also with *anomía* in LXX Ps. 36(MT 37):1; 52(53):2(Eng. v. 1); 57(58):3(2); 63(64):7(6); 88(89):23(22); 106(107):42; 124(125):3; Ezk. 33:13,18; or with *ánomos* in Job 27:4,7 (Symmachus) and *dólios* in Ps. 42(43):1. It thus understands *'wl(h)* as referring to a violation of justice (i.e., injustice) or of the law; in Ps. 42(43):1(superscription), it follows the context.

2. *Occurrences.* The word *'āwel* occurs 21 times in the OT (including 10 in Ezekiel, 3 in Psalms), *'awlâ* 33 times (10 in Job, 9 in Psalms, including 4 occurrences of *'wlth; 'lth* in Job 5:16; and 2 occurrences of *'wlt*), *'awwāl* 5 times (4 in Job), *'wl* piel twice (Ps. 71:4; Isa. 26:10). *'wl(h)* is "done, committed" (*'śh,* Lev. 19:15,35; Dt. 25:16; Ps. 37:1; Ezk. 3:20; 18:24,26; 33:13,15,18; Zeph. 3:5,13; *p'l* in Job 34:32; 36:23; Ps. 58:3[2]; 119:3; *t'b* hiphil in Ps. 53:2[1]); it can be "spoken" (*dbr* piel, Job 13:7; 27:4; cf. also 5:16; 6:30; Ps. 107:42; Isa. 59:3; Mal. 2:6) or "devised" (*hgh,* Isa. 59:3), "planned" (? *ḥpś,* Ps. 64:7[6]), and it can "happen in court" (*špṭ,* Ps. 82:2). The wicked person is a "man (*'îš*) of *'āwel*" (Prov. 29:27; Ps. 43:1), a "son (*ben*) of *'awlâ*" (2 S. 3:34; 7:10; 1 Ch. 17:9; Ps. 89:23[22]; Hos. 10:9).

In the Qumran writings *'āwel* occurs about 40 times, *'awlâ* about 30 times.

II. Meaning.

1. *Word Field.* Parallel words to *'wl(h)* include "sin" (*ḥaṭṭā'ṯ,* Job 24:19f.; Ezk. 3:20; 18:24; 28:15f.; *'wn,* Ezk. 28:18), "abomination" (*tô'ēḇâ,* Dt. 25:16; Ezk. 18:24; cf. Ps. 53:2[1]; Prov. 29:27), "iniquity" (*'āwen,* Job 11:14; Prov. 22:8), "evil" (*r'h,* Job 24:20f.), "that which is bad" (*hawwôṯ,* Job 6:30), "injustice" (*reša',* Job 34:10; cf. 34:12; Ps. 125:3; Hos. 10:13), "faithlessness" (*ma'alâ,* Ezk. 18:24), "bloodguilt" (*dāmîm,* Mic. 3:10; Hab. 2:12; cf. Isa. 59:3), "violence" (*ḥāmās,* Ps. 58:3[2]; Ezk. 28:15f.), "deceit" (*remîyâ,* Job 13:7; 27:4; *kaḥaš,* Hos. 10:13; *kāzāḇ,* Zeph. 3:13).

The person who has incurred guilt (*rāšā'*) commits *'wl(h)* (Job 27:7; Prov. 29:27; Ezk. 18:24,27; 33:15,19); similarly also the restless person (*ḥānēp,* NRSV "the god-

---

"Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im AT?" *ZTK* 52 (1955) 1-42; idem, *Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des AT. WdF* 125 (1972); F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte. BBB* 10 (1956); J. Pedersen, *ILC,* I-II; S. Porúbčan, *Sin in the OT: A Soteriological Study* (Rome, 1963); G. Quell, "ἁμαρτάνω, κτλ.," *TDNT,* I, 267-89; H. H. Schmid, *Gerechtigkeit als Weltordnung: Hintergrund und Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Gerechtigkeitsbegriffs. BHT* 40 (1968); G. Schrenk, "ἄδικος, κτλ.," *TDNT,* I, 149-63.

1. So Porúbčan, 16.

less," Job 27:8), the wicked (*mēraʿ*, Ps. 37:1), the "man of deceit" (*ʾîš mirmâ*, Ps. 43:1), the enemy (*ʾōyēḇ*, Ps. 89:23[22]), a person who is faithless (*lōʾ-ḥāsîḏ*, NRSV "ungodly," Ps. 43:1), a person who does not know God (*yāḏaʿ*, Job 18:21), who does what is bad (*pʿl ʾāwen*, Job 31:3), or oppresses others (*ʿnh*, 2 S. 7:10; Ps. 89:23[22]). God detests such a person and considers that person corrupt (Job 15:16).

Antitheses to *ʿwl(h)* include that which is right (*ṣedeq*, Lev. 19:15,35; cf. Dt. 25:15f.; Job 6:29; Ps. 58:2[1]; Hos. 10:12f.), righteousness (*ṣᵉḏāqâ*, Ezk. 3:20; 18:24,26; 33:13,18; Hos. 10:12), that which is in order or is commensurate with what is right (*mišpāṭ*, Dt. 32:4; Job 34:12; Zeph. 3:5; cf. Ps. 58:2[1]), faithfulness, reliability (*ʾᵉmûnâ*, Dt. 32:4), and reliable instruction (*tôraṯ ʾᵉmeṯ*, Mal. 2:6). The one who is upright (*yāšār*, Dt. 32:4; Ps. 92:16[15]; 107:42; Prov. 29:27), perfect (*tāmîm*, Dt. 32:4; Ps. 119:1; Ezk. 3:20), just (*ṣaddîq*, Dt. 32:4; Prov. 29:27; Ezk. 3:20; 18:8,24,26; 33:13,18; Zeph. 3:5), who does what is good (*ʿśh ṭôḇ*, Ps. 53:2[1]; cf. Job 24:21), and who returns to God (*šûḇ*, Job 22:23) has nothing to do with *ʿwl(h)*.

2. *Basic Meaning.* If this word field offers any indication regarding the original content of *ʿāwel* and *ʿawlâ*, they refer less to a specific deed and express rather a general negative assessment of a person's behavior and actions. This is probably why hardly any distinction is made between *ʿāwel* as a designation for a person's underlying disposition on the one hand, and *ʿawlâ* as an assessment of a specific act on the other. Both aspects are already discernible in the presumably earliest occurrence, 2 S. 3:34. In eulogizing Abner, David states, albeit cautiously and by way of comparison, that his death was not right because he was not a criminal and had not been found guilty through any legal proceeding. The men (so v. 30) who killed him did not act rightly, and were not "in order." Their false attitude and deed were not merely erroneous but were "un-right" in the ethical sense, i.e., an injustice. This constitutes a transgression because they departed from the right path, from the legal system to which a person must adhere; they deviated from that system and violated it. The sinful, wrong, and false aspects of their behavior and actions now cling to them; they are infected with injustice and belong to the "wicked" (*bᵉnê ʿawlâ*), those who have committed an injustice. So according to Hos. 10:9 must one also describe the Israelites (read *ʿawlâ* instead of *ʿalwâ*),[2] who have sinned since the time of the judges (at Gibeah; cf. Jgs. 19–21). Both substantively and temporally, *ʿawlâ* here functions as a generalizing concept; the characteristic feature of such persons is that they do not adhere to the proclaimed will of God. The same applies to the adversaries who would coerce the king (Ps. 89:23[22]) and to all who oppress Israel (2 S. 7:10). They turn against that which Yahweh has decreed: the "eternal" duration of the house of David or of Israel's dwelling in the land God has granted them.

3. *Court Procedure.* Lev. 19:15, a passage probably originally at home in an ancient decalog[3] with no further embellishment, lends expression to a universally valid princi-

2. So *BHK;* cf. *BHS.*
3. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 251f.

ple: "You shall do no injustice in judgment *(bammišpaṭ)*." Every proceeding must be conducted correctly, in the proper fashion. V. 15aβ makes this general prohibition concrete in stating that no partiality may be shown, and neither the poor nor the great may be favored. V. 15b expresses the principle positively: "With justice *(b^e ṣeḏeq)*," commensurate with the system and order God gave to the world and, in a particular way through election and the torah, to his people, "you shall judge your neighbor." V. 16 adds yet another specification in pointing out that injustice comes about in judgment through false accusation, preceded by slander and followed by bloodletting and execution (Ezk. 22:9), and through false witness (cf. Dt. 19:16-21). Lev. 19:17 adds the prohibitions against hating your kin or extracting vengeance, prohibitions that, although not directly related to legal proceedings as such, can nonetheless provide the background of unjust accusation. In the account of King Jehoshaphat's concern for justice (2 Ch. 19:4-11), the Chronicler falls back on the principle of Lev. 19:15 along with its explication in v. 15b. Partiality toward one or the other party is an injustice; the same applies to bribery (v. 7; cf. Dt. 16:18-20: judges "shall render just decisions . . . you must not distort justice; you must not show partiality; and you must not accept bribes. . . . Justice, and only justice, you shall pursue"). The example adduced is Yahweh (see below), and thus also the valid system and order that he not only gave but to which he himself adheres for the welfare of the people.

Still, a person who suffers under false accusation may well ask, "Do you indeed decree what is right, you mighty ones [*'ēlîm* instead of *'ēlem*]? Do you judge people fairly?" (Ps. 58:2[1]). The petitioner himself answers: "No, you work on the earth with unjust [*'āwel* with Syr., Targ. instead of MT *'ôlôṯ*] hearts; you weigh out the violence of your hands" (v. 3[2]). The falsely persecuted person fears that he will encounter injustice if charged in court because *ṣeḏeq* is not practiced, which always aims at "the right order."[4] The wicked accuser should be punished, the accused righteous person delivered. The oppressed person hopes in Yahweh, "a God who judges on earth" (v. 12[11]). There is such a judge (82:8) who will make the gods accountable: "How long will you judge unjustly and show partiality to the wicked?" (82:2). They will be punished by death (v. 7). A later addendum to this mythologically colored text (vv. 3,4) indicates how such right judging will manifest itself: the right of the weak and the orphan, the lowly and the destitute, will be maintained, and the weak and the needy will be delivered from the hand of the wicked. Not to help such people in court would be unjust. Indeed, petitioners in the Psalms do complain of injustice before the court, either from a former friend who acts deceitfully in the legal dispute (43:1), from people who devise injustice and then suddenly raise a crushing accusation (64:7[6]), or from those who are themselves guilty of doing what is wrong and then also oppress others (71:4). But whoever is just and stays away from injustice will behave correctly in legal proceedings: "He executes true justice between contending parties" (Ezk. 18:8).

---

4. Jepsen, 80.

4. *Unjust Deeds.* Various individual deeds seem especially or primarily to be viewed as *'āwel* or *'awlâ.* Lev. 19:35 prohibits using false measures of "length, weight, and quantity." The term *bammišpāṭ* qualifies the weights and measures and was either inadvertently incorporated from 19:15 or points out that the use of weights and measures is a procedure to be conducted justly. V. 36 then stipulates positively that the weights and measures must be correct (*ṣeḏeq,* NRSV "honest") and must agree with the standard fixed and recognized by the community. Amos (8:5) and Hosea (12:8[7]) already complain about reduced measurements of volume and false weights and balances. Dt. 25:13-16 forbids having two kinds of weights and measures, i.e., one that is full and correct, and one that is smaller and false. Whoever does business with such duplicity commits *'āwel,* does not act rightly, deprives his neighbors of that to which they have a right within the obtaining order and system (cf. the stipulation in Ezk. 45:10), violates God's will, and is a swindler and an abomination *(tô'ēḇâ)* to Yahweh. Ezk. 28:18 condemns dishonest commercial transactions. David indirectly labels the killing of Abner a misdeed by referring negatively to the perpetrators (2 S. 3:34; see above), since this involved an illegal act of blood vengeance. To build Zion and Jerusalem with bloodguilt would be *'awlâ* (Mic. 3:10). Workers apparently die through exploitation, mistreatment, or punishment during the busy construction activity under King Hezekiah (cf. also Jer. 22:13). Hab. 2:12 raises the same charge in an oracle of woe against the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar, with the preceding oracle (vv. 9-11) denouncing the injustice the latter perpetrated against the plundered peoples as he was "expanding" his dynasty and building citadels. Both cases involve the use of lethal force rather than a direct act of murder. A similar situation applies in Isa. 59:3, where a probable reference to 1:15 ("your hands are full of blood") understands the bloodstained hands as being defiled with injustice, interpreting them in the sense of false accusation in court (vv. 3b,4; see above). Isa. 1:15 shows that the prophet finds "bloodstained hands" not only where blood is actually spilled but in any curtailment of a neighbor's rights.[5]

According to Zeph. 3:13, "doing *'awlâ*" means "uttering lies," referring not to false accusation but to disloyalty and deception in daily human relationships and in one's relationship to Yahweh (cf. Hos. 7:13). "As *pars pro toto,* a lying tongue can reveal the attitude, even the essence, of a person."[6] Jer. 8:5 refers to apostasy from God and to the refusal to return as "deceit" (cf. Ps. 78:36f., where the people's deceit and lies result from not keeping their hearts steadfast toward Yahweh and from not remaining true to his covenant). The use of force is doubtless the reason oppressors are called *b^enê 'awlâ* (2 S. 7:10), referring to the nations and rulers of Canaan during the time of the judges, and perhaps also to the Egyptians, who kept Israel in bondage. In his oath of purification (Ps. 7:4[3]), an accused person assures Yahweh that there is no wrong in his hands; he has done his friend no wrong (v. 5[4]), and has neither misused that person's trust nor robbed him, referring probably to infringement on the other person's property. Job 29:15f. involves the taking of someone else's possessions, an act considered especially reprehensi-

5. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 1–12* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1991), in loc.
6. M. A. Klopfenstein, "כזב *kzb* to lie," *TLOT,* II, 607.

ble when perpetrated on the poor. The wrongdoer (*ʿawwāl*) is compared with an animal of prey. Job himself avows his innocence, admitting that he would have become such an evildoer had he given in to his own lecherous glances at a young girl (31:1,3). Even an unrighteous attitude or disposition, one running contrary to the ethical order, is classified as *ʿāwel.* Finally, this term also refers to the false, incorrect exercise of one's vocation (Mal. 2:6). One of the priests' main tasks, and something Levi did correctly, is to give the people reliable instruction (*tôraṯ ʾemeṯ*); by not doing this, the priests incur guilt.

Hence various individual acts are characterized as unjust, acts taking place within the social context and involving interpersonal relationships within the community. When all these acts are viewed together from the perspective of an overriding, generic concept of this sort, an interpretation of them as "unjust" in the broader sense reveals a generalizing tendency in the use of the terms.

5. *Human Behavior at Large.* Reference to a person as "unjust" focuses simultaneously on that person's deeds as well as the disposition to commit such deeds (cf. Ezk. 28:15). Such is the case when Ezk. 18:24 (cf. 33:15) summarizes a whole series of wicked deeds, deeds enumerated in vv. 5-18, under the expression "to commit iniquity," i.e., to commit all the abominable deeds just enumerated. The prophet doubtless does not intend to offer an exhaustive list of such wrongful deeds, but rather to show through important examples how an evildoer behaves. Commensurately, he describes the righteous person as someone who "withholds his hand from iniquity" (v. 8), an expression that, although indeed also appearing in connection with correct behavior in legal contexts, is here (cf. vv. 24,26) to be understood in the more comprehensive sense. Quite the opposite is to be expected from the wicked (*rāšāʿ,* 33:13); in a general sense that person does what is bad. Hence *ʿāwel* summarizes a general disposition in the sense of a negative overall assessment. One might also consider that one or the other of the transgressions adduced here already justifies such a verdict (cf. 18:10, if the corrupt text is interpreted correctly).[7] Job 31 points in the same direction as Ezk. 18. There Job's oath of purification evokes the image of an evildoer by describing that person's perverted and sinful disposition in the larger sense.

Similarly, Ps. 37:1 uses the expression "doing wrong" as a comprehensive superscription preceding any reference to specifics. The psalmist, doubtless drawing from personal experience, describes the wicked and their fate in contrast to the righteous. The wicked do not do what is good; they reject God and do not follow his established order (53:2[1]); nor do they walk in his ways (119:3). The enemies of the Davidic king reject Yahweh's decree assuring that the house of David will "endure forever," and they are thus indicted for injustice (89:23[22]). Even more, they are evildoers, which includes anyone who violates even a portion of the divine ordinances; such persons are called *bᵉnê ʿawlâ.* Job's friends suspect that he is hiding some evil deed (Job 11:14) that makes him a sinful person in the larger sense. It would be even worse if wickedness were dwelling in his tents (11:14; 22:23), since then he would be as familiar with

7. But see also I.4.

evil as with a housemate; indeed, commensurate with its nature, evil would gain control over him and rule his life with wrong. Job, however, rejects all this, and what he says in his own defense is by no means inconsistent with his self-assessment (6:30; 27:4). In view of the attacks of his friends, he considers himself delivered up to "the wicked," to each of them who judges unjustly and thus are wrongdoers (16:11). Eliphaz's attacks on Job go so far that they find him virtually saturated with iniquity. Such a person is so corrupt that doing wrong has itself become a need, and the person drinks wrongdoing like water (15:16).

If this seems a bit exaggerated, Hosea must nonetheless say that even God's own people, on the whole, has committed wickedness in both deed and disposition, has not adhered to the divine will, and has not served Yahweh (Hos. 10:13). Only in the coming period of salvation "shall the remnant of Israel do no more wrong" (Zeph. 3:13). Then, as the people petition in Ps. 125:3, the godless foreign scepter will not rest on the land, "so that the righteous might not stretch out their hands to do wrong," i.e., be tempted to abandon the correct way of life according to Yahweh's guidance. There are those, however, the wicked, who do not "learn" what righteousness is even when God shows them compassion; rather, "they deal perversely in the land of uprightness" (Isa. 26:10). There will always be an antithesis between the righteous and the dishonest, whose image and essence always includes injustice (Prov. 29:27). The term *ʿāwel* characterizes those who are not "in order," those who are to be turned away ("detested"). The righteous must keep their distance from such people.

6. *Revenge for Injustice.* Basically, "whoever sows injustice *(ʿawlâ)* will reap calamity *(ʾāwen)*" (Prov. 22:8). Deed and consequence correspond. Hos. 10:13 uses the metaphor of reaping and sowing to point out that wickedness *(rešaʿ)* generates injustice *(ʿawlāṯâ),* and injustice, lies *(kaḥaš).* That is, a disposition that in God's eyes is not in order will generate unjust actions and will not lead to the intended result. Job and his friends agree that injustice in and of itself brings down disaster and misfortune on the perpetrator. Although both sides address the deed-consequence connection, they take different points of departure. Job's friends conclude from his illness that, commensurate with the nature of human behavior (15:16), he must have committed some wrong, something clearly following from the fate of those who do such things (18:21). People such as Job, like the injustice they do, are broken to pieces (24:20). Yahweh intervenes and turns against every unjust act (cf. 5:16; Ps. 107:42). The logical conclusion is to turn back to God and to stay away from any wrongful, unjust disposition or actions (Job 11:14; 22:23). If Job will decide to do what is just and right, God will accept him again, eliminate the consequences of his wrongful actions, and reestablish him (22:21-30).

Job also takes the act-consequence connection as his point of departure (as shown by his purification oath, ch. 31; cf. Ps. 7:4-6[3-5]), but argues from the reverse perspective. Precisely because he has committed no wrong, and has even thwarted such (Job 29:17), he can confess no guilt (6:29f.; 27:4), is suffering unjustly himself, and must be returned to his former condition. His friends, Job believes, are themselves wrong, and are committing injustice (6:29; 13:7), becoming thus his enemies (27:7).

The book of Job does not dissolve this connection between act and consequence. It

remains in force. Hence "happy are those who keep his [Yahweh's] decrees, who seek him with their whole heart, who also do no wrong" (Ps. 119:2f.); they will never be put to shame (v. 6).

III. Yahweh and Injustice. Only God is capable of thwarting the evil consequences of an act once the perpetrator has shown a willingness to return (Ezk. 18; Job 11:13ff.; 22:21-30). Those who do wrong will not see Yahweh's majesty (Isa. 26:10), nor will they experience the saving effects of his royal power. Yahweh has nothing to do with injustice or wrong; he is completely free of it. Elihu defends him against any suspicion in this regard (Job 34:10ff.,32; 36:23). God compensates justly, does not bend the law, does not err, and is never in a position where he must say, "if I have done iniquity, I will do it no more." No one must teach him what is right. The thanksgiving hymn Ps. 92 concludes (v. 16[15]) by emphasizing that "there is no unrighteousness in him." He makes things right, acts rightly, punishes his adversaries, the wicked and the evildoers, and makes the righteous prosper. He is dependable, and is firm as a rock in his steadfast love and faithfulness. On that the righteous can rely.

Zeph. 3:1-5 also speaks of Yahweh's just revenge; Yahweh "does no wrong." This passage censures the evil deeds of Jerusalem and of its prominent groups (princes, judges, prophets, priests), and extols Yahweh's just actions in court. Yahweh intervenes for righteousness, quite in contrast to these groups, who do quite the opposite of what their position and vocation demand by exploiting others, putting their own interests first, and falsifying Yahweh's will (v. 5). Yahweh always acts correctly. Such evildoers *(ʿawwāl),* however, are not impressed by God's justified chastising actions. In words of hymnic praise, Dt. 32:4 extols Yahweh as being "without deceit," comprehensively denying thus any connection between God and what is evil or false. It then contrasts his people with him as being a "perverse and crooked generation," and positively emphasizes how Yahweh is and how he acts, extolling him further as a rock, i.e., as shelter, security, aid, deliverance, and as being of unshakable loyalty. His actions are perfect *(tāmîm),* all his ways are just *(mišpāṭ).* He is just *(ṣaddîq)* and upright *(yāšār).* Nothing about him, not his planning or his behavior or his actions, is not just and right. In a discourse of accusation, Yahweh points out to his faithless people that to abandon him and seek salvation from worthless idols is thus utterly unjustified (Jer. 2:5).

IV. Qumran. The term *ʿwl* occurs about 40 times in the Qumran writings, with *ʿwlh* occurring about 30 times (including *ʿwl* 13 times in 1QS, 5 in 1QH, and *ʿwlh* 9 times in 1QS, 10 in 1QH). Altogether this yields more occurrences than for *ḥṭʾh(t), ʾwn,* or *pšʿ.* The kind of human disposition, behavior, and actions from which the community wants to distance itself is indicated largely with *ʿwl/ʿwlh.* This is particularly the case in the doctrine of the two spirits (1QS 3:13–4:26). God has "appointed" for human beings the spirits of truth and injustice (3:19) "in which to walk until the time of his visitation" (3:18). These two spirits dwell and struggle within the human heart (4:23), and a person acts according to his or her portion of each spirit. A catalog of vices (4:9-11) circumscribes what belongs to the "spirit of injus-

tice": "greed, and slackness in the search for righteousness, wickedness and lies, haughtiness and pride, falseness and deceit, cruelty and abundant evil, ill-temper and much folly and brazen insolence, abominable deeds committed in a spirit of lust, and ways of lewdness in the service of uncleanness, a blaspheming tongue, blindness of eye and dullness of ear, stiffness of neck and heaviness of heart, so that a person walks in all the ways of darkness and guile." Emphasis is on transgressions directed against the community and against adherence to its pure doctrine. God has prepared a judgment of purification "with the spirit of holiness" (4:20f.) for those whom he has "chosen for an everlasting covenant" (v. 22), and an annihilating final judgment for the others (4:11-14). "Men of the congregation" will separate themselves from "men of injustice" (5:2,10; 6:15; 8:13; 9:9,17,21; 10:20) in order to live according to God's will (5:10; 1QH 6:6f.) and according to the guidance of the Zadokites (1QS 5:2ff.). Their deeds must be and remain purified from all injustice (8:18). The petitioner laments his entanglement in sinful humanity (11:9), distances himself from all injustice (10:20; 1QH 16:11; 14:25f.), demands the same from the righteous (1QH 1:36), expects God's help (11:22,26) and judgment (14:15,25; cf. 1QM 4:3) of all injustice, and in praise confesses his faith in the true God (1QH 15:25).

Schreiner

עוֹלָה *'ôlâ;* → עֹלָה *'ōlâ*

עוֹלָם *'ôlām;* עָלַם *'ālam*

Contents: I. General Considerations. II. (Long Ago) Bygone Times. III. The (Distant) Future. IV. Theological Usage. V. Apocrypha, Early Judaism, Qumran.

'ôlām. J. Barr, *Biblical Words for Time. SBT* 1/33 (London, [2]1969); C. Barth, *Diesseits und Jenseits im Glauben des späten Israel. SBS* 72 (1974); T. Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1960), 123-54, esp. 137ff.; S. J. DeVries, *Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow* (Grand Rapids, 1975), 31f., 38-40; G. Gerleman, "Die sperrende Grenze: Die Wurzel *'lm* im Hebräischen," *ZAW* 91 (1979) 338-49; E. Jenni, "Das Wort *'ôlām* im AT," *ZAW* 64 (1952) 197-248; 65 (1953) 1-35 (= Berlin, 1953); idem, "עוֹלָם *'ōlām* eternity," *TLOT,* II, 852-62; B. Kedar, *Biblische Semantik* (Stuttgart, 1981), 25, 92, 176, 179f.; B. Long, "Notes on the Biblical Use of עד־עולם," *WTJ* 41 (1978) 54-67; C. von Orelli, *Die hebräischen Synonyma der Zeit und Ewigkeit genetisch und sprachlvergleichend dargestellt* (Leipzig, 1871); K. Schubert, "Biblische Endzeiterwartung und biblischer Fortschrittsglaube," *BiLi* 51 (1978) 96-100; J. R. Wilch, *Time and Event* (Leiden, 1969), 17-19; H. W. Wolff, *Anthropology of the OT* (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1974), 89, 90.

I. General Considerations. The Hebrew word עולם *'ôlām* (22 times as עֹלָם *'ōlām* in *BHK*^{3}/*BHS*;[1] cf., e.g., Ps. 45:7,18[Eng. vv. 6,17]) occurs almost 440 times in the OT, plus 20 times in the Aramaic parts of the OT (as *'ālam* or *'ālmā'*, more often pl. there than in the Hebrew parts). Its etymology has been and remains disputed or at best uncertain, and the various studies suggest that no real progress has been made. On the one hand, most scholars adduce the root *'lm* I, understanding *'ôlām* as similar to an adverb ending in *-ām*.[2] On the other hand, the debate between C. F. Whitley and S. C. Reif left its findings open, while G. Gerleman made an unpersuasive attempt to deduce a basic meaning of "horizon, boundary" (metaphorically as "exclusivity" in combinations such as those with *b^{e}rîṯ*) on the basis of a rather narrowly conceived translation as "extremely old, ancient," and taking 1 S. 27:8 as his point of departure (where the text probably must undergo some emendation).[3]

Following E. Jenni, most scholars translate *'ôlām* as "long time" or "farthest, remotest time."[4] The various nuances of this translation must then also be distinguished contextually.[5]

Although the number of occurrences is often given as precisely 440 (plus 20 times in Aramaic),[6] textual problems prevent a whole series of (Hebrew) occurrences from being adduced with absolute certainty. These include 1 S. 27:8; 2 S. 13:18; 2 Ch. 33:7; Ps. 73:12; 87:5; Prov. 23:10 (cf. 22:28); Isa. 44:7; 57:11; 64:4(5); Jer. 49:36; Ezk. 32:27.[7] The Aramaic occurrences are in Ezra (4:15,19) and Daniel (18 in Aramaic in addition to 5 in Hebrew).[8] Only beginning with Jeremiah is *'ôlām* used with the article (13 times), though no semantic shift seems discernible; it is used with a suffix only in Eccl. 12:5. The plural occurs by percentage more frequently in the Aramaic texts than in the Hebrew texts (Aramaic in Dnl. 2:4,44; 3:9; 5:10; 6:7,22,27[6,21,26]; 7:18; cf. Hebrew in 9:24); the Hebrew plural occurs only in Isa. 45:17b in the absolute state, otherwise only in construct (Ps. 77:6[5]; 145:13; Isa. 26:4; 45:17a; 51:9; Dnl. 9:24; with *l^e* in Ps. 77:8[7]; as an adv. acc. in 1 K. 8:13 par. 2 Ch. 6:2; Ps. 61:5[4]). That *'ôlām* can have a plural at all might indicate that it can also refer to a "period of time," with the plural then referring to "periods of time, ages," or something similar. This situation, however, applies only to its later use in early Judaism and in the following pe-

---

1. See Jenni, *ZAW* 64 (1952) 222.

2. Ibid., 199, 202; also Jenni, *TLOT*, II, 852.

3. Reif, review of *Koheleth: His Language and Thought*, by Whitley, *VT* 31 (1981) 120-26; Whitley, "A Reply to Dr. S. C. Reif," *VT* 32 (1982) 344; Reif, "A Reply to Dr. C. F. Whitley," ibid., 347; Gerleman. Cf. H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 474.

4. Cf. K. Koch, "Geschichte, Geschichtsschreibung, Geschichtsphilosophie II," *TRE* XII (1984), 573, who translates "inconceivably long time."

5. Cf. II and III below; concerning the problems attaching to these translations, cf. also H. M. Kuitert, "Die Beschäftigung der Theologie mit der Sprache," *TLZ* 107 (1982) 404.

6. Jenni; *HAL*, II, 798.

7. Concerning the distribution of these occurrences (the term is not used in Nahum, Haggai, Ruth, Esther), see *TLOT*, II, 852f.

8. See III, IV below.

riod.[9] A genuinely numeric plural occurs in the Hebrew OT at most only in Eccl. 1:10; otherwise the reference is usually to the iterative, extensive, amplifying plural.[10]

What the few plural occurrences of *'ôlām* already show becomes quite evident in the numerous occurrences of the singular. In the OT (as also in Ugaritic texts), *'ôlām* is used not as an independent subject or object but rather largely within construct combinations or as an adverbial accusative.[11] Hence *'ôlām* occurs in connection with terms for love (Jer. 31:3), signs (Isa. 55:13), joy (Isa. 35:10, etc.), shame and disgrace (Ps. 78:66; Jer. 23:40), a heap of ruins (Dt. 13:17[16]; Josh. 8:28), appointments (Ex. 29:28; 30:21; Lev. 6:11,15[18,22] etc.), possessions (Gen. 17:8; 48:4, etc.), *b^erîṯ* (16 times), etc.[12] Similarly frequent combinations with other future-oriented lexemes underscore that *'ôlām* functions to express the highest possible intensification ("perpetual holding," "unending joy," etc.); in such combinations with *'ôlām,* these lexemes are themselves intensified (cf., e.g., the combination with → עד *'aḏ,* with → חיים *ḥayyîm,* or with → דור *dôr,* including examples in the pl.).[13]

Although *'ôlām* is not yet attested in extrabiblical Hebrew witnesses (ostraca, inscriptions), its corresponding equivalents occur relatively frequently in texts within the OT environs.[14] Reference can be made first to Ugaritic witnesses, particularly since combinations with the preps. *l^e* and *'aḏ* are also already attested here.[15] Within Old Aramaic, texts from Sefire and Ahiqar are joined by one witness from Deir 'Alla.[16] Occurrences in Phoenician are frequent, while the orthography אולם is found in Punic.[17] The findings in Old South Arabic are disputed.[18] The Moabite of the Mesha inscription attests both meanings for *'lm:* "for always, perpetual" and "since time immemorial."[19]

Following Biblical Aramaic, *'lm* (or similar forms) occurs in numerous more recent

---

9. Cf. V. This may actually already be the case beginning with Daniel; see IV.

10. See IV; Jenni, *ZAW* 64 (1952) 244, 247, who also calls this the "intensive plural of feeling."

11. Cf. *Synt,* §§89ff. On Eccl. 1:10 and 3:11 see IV.10 and Jenni, *ZAW* 65 (1953) 22ff.

12. See II-IV below.

13. See II and III below.

14. Cf. *HAL,* II, 798; *DNSI,* II, 858f.; Jenni, *ZAW* 64 (1952) 202-21. Concerning Sirach and Qumran, see V.

15. See *KTU,* 1.2 IV, 10; 1.4 IV, 42; 4.360, 2; 2.19 5, 15; 3.5, 14; 2.42, 9, "king of the world"? Cf. *UT,* no. 1858; *WUS,* no. 2036; then also A. Schoors, *RSP,* I, 62, no. 48 on Ps. 21:5(4); further ibid., 80 §6.1.d; and M. Dahood, ibid., 291, no. 413 on Ps. 48:9,15(8,14); also nos. 363, 405, 411, 413, 425. For additional discussion see II-IV below.

16. Sefire III, 24f.; there also I C 9 and I B 7? Cf. *KAI,* 224:24f.; and J. A. Fitzmyer and D. J. Harrington, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts. BietOr* 34 (1978), 352b. Ahiqar, saying 13, 7:95? (broken text); Deir 'Alla combination I, l. 7 (other numbering: l. 9); cf. also Beyer, 658f.

17. For Phoenician see Z. S. Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language. AOS* 8 (1936; repr. 1971), 133; J. Friedrich and W. Röllig, *Phönizische-punische Grammatik. AnOr* 46 (²1970), §§78a, 79b, p. 30; Jenni, *TLOT,* II, 858; W. Röllig, "Schöpfung," *WbMyth,* I, 309; H. Gese et al., *Die Religionen Altsyriens, Altarabiens und der Mandäer. RM* 10/2 (1970), 148, 203; cf. *KAI,* I, 1; 14:20, 23; 18:8; 19:11; concerning *KAI,* I, 1 (Ahiram), cf. Eccl. 12:5(?); Jenni, *ZAW* 64 (1952) 207f., 211. For Punic see *KAI,* 128:2.

18. Jenni, *ZAW* 64 (1952) 220f.

19. Ll. 7, 10; *KAI,* 181.

Semitic languages (Nabatean, Jewish Aramaic, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Samaritan, Syriac, Mandaic, Ethiopic, Palmyrene, Egyptian Arabic, Arabic).[20] Beginning approximately in the 1st century A.D., several of these languages start using *'lm* in a meaning different from that of the OT, namely, as "world" or "aeon."[21] Akkadian attests only the substantively parallel lexeme *dārû(m)*.[22]

J. Assmann has shown anew that the Egyptians did not distinguish clearly between "time" and "eternity."[23] They used both the term *nḥḥ* (the fullness of time, referring more to what is coming and the change it will bring) and the term *ḏ.t* (as consummation, referring more to what endures, abides; the two words often occur together), referring to a long but finite period of time as something "unending," so that here, too, context must determine whether the translation "time" or "eternity" is more appropriate.

The LXX generally renders *'ôlām* (236 times) as *aiṓn* or *aiṓnios* (95 times), less frequently as *aeí* or *archḗ*, and 4 times as *chrónos*.[24]

The previously mentioned occurrence of *'ôlām* in various word and phrase combinations also suggests that the word field associated with *'ôlām* is considerable.[25] Terms include → בוא, *bā'ôṯ*, → דור *dôr*, → יום *yôm*, *hakkōl*, → נצח *nēṣaḥ*, → עד *'aḏ*, → עת *'ēṯ*, → קדם *qeḏem*, and → תמיד *tāmîḏ*.[26]

II. (Long Ago) Bygone Times. About 60 occurrences of *'ôlām* (over 20 with the prep. *min*) refer to a time long past, or to something extraordinarily old, albeit with different qualities of remoteness from the speaker/writer on the one hand, and the observer on the other.

The expression *mē'ôlām* can mean "from time immemorial" (Ps. 25:6; Jer. 2:20; 31:3; Ezk. 35:5; then Isa. 64:4[5] (here an isolated *'ôlām*? probably also Josh. 24:2 and the Mesha inscription;[27] cf. Joel 2:2, NRSV "from antiquity"; also Job 22:15: the way of the wicked "from of old"; and the Aramaic occurrences in Ezr. 4:14,19).

Mountains and hills are "ancient" (Gen. 49:26; Hab. 3:6), as are gates (Ps. 24:7,9; cf. also Jer. 5:15; Ezk. 36:2). Just how old or past the reference is usually remains open. The point is merely to direct one's attention as far back as possible. The most distant time (Ps. 93:2) can then also refer to an otherwise indeterminate "distant past" (Gen. 6:4)[28] or even to those who died long ago (Lam. 3:6; Ps. 143:3; cf. Ezk. 26:20), or simply an "earlier" time (Josh. 24:2; cf. the expression "as earlier" in Mic. 7:14; Mal. 3:4).

---

20. Concerning Elephantine, cf. *AP*, 304a. Concerning Hatra, cf. *DNSI*, I, xli; and II, 858f.
21. See V below, also Jenni, *TLOT*, II, 862.
22. *AHw*, I, 164.
23. J. Assmann, *Ägypten: Theologie und Frömmigkeit einer frühen Hochkultur. Urban Taschenbücher* 366 (Stuttgart, 1984), 90ff., 132f.; cf. idem, "Das Doppelgesicht der Zeit im altägyptischen Denken," *Die Zeit*, ed. A. Peisl and A. Mohler (1983), 189-223.
24. See *TDNT*, I, 197-209; *ThWNT*, X/2, 962f.; *EDNT*, I, 44-48.
25. To be discussed in II-IV below.
26. On *yôm* see VI, 13f.; on *kōl*, VII, 138.
27. See *KAI*, 181:10.
28. Cf. *KAI*, 181:10(?).

Among the remaining occurrences (including Dt. 33:15; 1 S. 27:8; Isa. 44:7; 51:9; 63:9,11; Jer. 5:15; 6:16; 18:18; 28:8; Ezk. 25:15; 26:20; cf. Sir. 16:7; 44 superscription,2; 48:25; cf. also 42:21 with the article, "one is from all eternity[?]"; then also 51:8, or "already from an earlier time"? also Ps. 41:14[13]), Mic. 5:1(2) and Am. 9:11 are noteworthy inasmuch as they refer this past time to the time of David as the idealized past.[29] Given Prov. 22:28, one might inquire whether 23:10 should not read → אלמנה *'almānâ* instead of *'ôlām*.[30] In Prov. 8:23 (within the context vv. 22-31) Wisdom remarks in first-person discourse that she was created by Yahweh even before the creation of the world, and indeed was herself present at the creation of the world.[31]

This intensifying inclination is also attested in the combination *min- (mē) (hā)'ôlām (wᵉ)'ad-'ôlām,* which usually in later texts (cf. combinations with *mē'attâ* in Ps. 113:2; 115:18; 121:8; 125:2; 131:3; Isa. 9:6[7]; 59:21; Mic. 4:7)[32] and in the solemn, liturgically elevated language of prayers and doxologies celebrates hymnically God's "eternity" or qualifies such praise as having already been sung much earlier and, indeed, will be sung much later as well and ultimately even "for all time"[33] (with the article in 1 Ch. 16:36; Neh. 9:5; Ps. 41:14[13]; 106:48; without the article in 1 Ch. 29:10; Ps. 90:2; 103:17; Aramaic in Dnl. 2:10; then also in Sir. 39:20, already as "ages of the world"? further also in the Qumran texts).[34]

When *'ôlām* (with *min*) is negated with reference to the past (Isa. 63:19a; 64:3[4]; Joel 2:2), it expresses the notion "never."[35]

III. The (Distant) Future. In over 260 instances *'ôlām* is used in reference to the future. In many cases (about 160 times), the substantive is preceded by *lᵉ* (more common when the reference is to something static or unchangeable) or (about 80 times) an *'ad* (focusing more dynamically on the temporal progression).[36] The actual "duration" is often specified as "for always," "perpetual" (esp. with *lᵉ*) in many combinations and as an adverbial accusative with largely concrete and often plural referential words (something also attested by the parallel expressions; cf. 1 S. 1:11,22,28; Ps. 34:1[superscription]; 71:15; 89:2[1]; 104:33).[37] Such duration does not, however, necessarily

29. See IV.2 below.

30. But cf. M. Dahood, *RSP,* I, 78.

31. → נסך *nsk* niphal; concerning this passage, cf. M. Dahood, "Proverbs 8,22-31," *CBQ* 30 (1968) 515; on its interpretation and theological relevance, see esp. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 91ff.; cf. Sir. 1:1,4.

32. See in this regard S. E. Loewenstamm, "Notes on the History of Biblical Phraesology," *Comparative Studies in Biblical and Ancient Oriental Literature. AOAT* 204 (1980), 166-70.

33. Jenni, *ZAW* 64 (1952) 234.

34. See V below.

35. Cf. the analogous use with reference to the future in III below; there, too, with the meaning "never."

36. For the former see *DNSI,* II, 860, "everlasting"; for the latter, Jenni, *ZAW* 64 (1952) 236f.; concerning the attendant verbs, cf. also 237ff.

37. Cf. in this regard also Long.

mean "perpetually, for always," something attested by 1 S. 2:30f., where the time in question must at some point come to an end.

This particular usage, occurring also in texts from the OT environs,[38] is attested in the most varied textual types and periods of OT literature (Gen. 3:22; 6:3; 13:15; Ex. 3:15; 14:13; 15:18; 19:9; 40:15; Dt. 5:29; 23:4,7[3,6]; 28:46: like here and in Gen. 13:15 also in 1 S. 20:42; 2 S. 22:51 par., etc., together with → זרע *zera'* or → דור *dôr* or with the latter in the pl.; then 1 S. 1:22; 20:15; 20:23,45; Ezr. 9:12; 2 S. 23:5; Ps. 30:13[12]; 49:9[8]; 61:8[7]; 66:7; 73:12; 89:2,3,38[1,2,37]; 90:2; 106:31; Prov. 27:24, "forever"; Isa. 30:8; 35:10; 55:3; 60:19f.; Jer. 20:7; 23:40; Ezk. 25:15; Jon. 2:7[6]). Job will not live "forever" (7:16), and the same is asked analogously with regard to the prophets (Zec. 1:5). The stones in the Jordan will be an "abiding" memorial (Josh. 4:7). Ps. 77:8(7); 1 K. 8:13; and 2 Ch. 6:2 all speak of coming times (pl.!).

With future reference, negated *'ôlām* can mean both "no longer" (Ex. 14:13) and "never" (1 S. 20:15; Neh. 13:1; Isa. 25:2; Jer. 35:6; Ezk. 26:21; 27:36; 28:19; cf. Dt. 23:4-7[3-6]).[39]

The obvious use of *'ôlām* in Ex. 21:6; Dt. 15:17; 1 S. 27:12 (cf. Lev. 25:46; 1 S. 1:22; Job 40:28[41:4]) to mean "as long as one lives" (e.g., a slave for life) does not necessarily contradict its other meanings, for even when the king is greeted with "may the king live forever," this does not, despite the obvious presence of "courtly style," imply the wish that the king be granted eternal life, but rather that he live "as long as possible" (contrast Job 7:16).[40]

When referring thus to a time enduring long into the future, *'ôlām* is quite naturally and often combined with and intensified or strengthened by other lexemes. These include *dôr* (or its pl. or dual; usually with *l^e*) (Gen. 16:7; Ex. 3:15; 31:16; Dt. 32:7; Ps. 33:11; 45:18[17]; 49:12[11]; 61:7f.[6f.]; 77:8f.[7f.]; 79:13; 85:6[5]; 100:5; 102:13[12]; 106:31; 119:89f.; 135:13; 146:10; Prov. 27:24; Eccl. 1:4; Isa. 34:10,17; 51:8; Dnl. 3:33[4:3]; 4:31[34]; Sir. 45:26). An analogous situation already obtained in Ugarit.[41]

One additional intensifying combination is the expression *(l^e) 'ôlām wā'eḏ* (Ex. 15:18; Ps. 9:6[5]; 10:16; 21:5[4]; 37:27 [following LXX]; 45:7,18[6,17]; 52:10[8]; 104:5; 119:44; 145:1,2,21; Dnl. 12:3; Mic. 4:5; Sir. 40:17), which Jenni calls a "solemn formula of conclusion and reinforcement"[42] (cf. also the noun → עד *'aḏ* together with *'ôlām* in Ps. 111:8; 148:6; Isa. 45:17). The formula *mē'attâ (w^e) 'aḏ-'ôlām* is simi-

---

38. E.g., *KAI,* 14:20, 22; 18:8; 19:11; 26A IV:2; C V:6; 27:14[?]; 34:5; 35:2; 181:7 (without *l^e*); 165:8; then with *'aḏ: KAI,* 43:12; 78:1; concerning the Ugaritic evidence, see Jenni, *TLOT,* II, 857; and Dahood, *RSP,* I, 290f., nos. 411, 413; concerning Deir 'Alla 7 see H. and M. Weippert, "Die 'Bileam'-Inschrift von *Tell Dēr 'Allā,*" *ZDPV* 98 (1982) 93.

39. Cf. *DNSI,* II, 859f., with frequent funerary inscriptional witnesses.

40. See IV.2 below. Cf. Jenni, *TLOT,* II, 857, who also includes Ugaritic witnesses for the meaning "as long as one lives"; see also Dahood, *RSP,* I, 287f., no. 405; and idem, "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 345.

41. Dahood, *RSP,* III, 201, Sup. no. 81: cf. Ex. 3:15; then R. Whitaker, *RSP,* III, 218, Sup. no. 3; and Dahood, *RSP,* I, 294f., no. 425; see also Jenni, *ZAW* 64 (1952) 203.

42. *ZAW* 64 (1952) 239.

larly "solemn" (Ps. 113:2; 115:18; 121:8; 125:2; 131:3; Isa. 9:6[7]; 59:21; Mic. 4:7; cf. Sir. 51:30 [all these are probably later texts]).

Finally, the formula "for his steadfast love endures forever" *([kî] le'ôlām ḥasdô)* should be mentioned. Apart from Ps. 136, where it is a refrain in every verse, it occurs 16 times in the OT (1 Ch. 16:34,41; 2 Ch. 5:13; 7:3,6; 20:21; Ezr. 3:11; Ps. 100:5; 106:1; 107:1; 118:1-4,29; 136 [26 times]; Jer. 33:11; also Sir. 51:12).[43]

This context of reinforcement and intensification also includes the use of *'ôlām* in oaths (Dt. 32:40, divine discourse; cf. Josh. 14:9; Jer. 49:13; Dnl. 12:7; Zeph. 2:9)[44] or in asseveration (2 S. 3:28; 7:26,29).

The term *'ôlām* then also occurs over 120 times in construct combinations, especially with a future orientation within theologically significant contexts.[45]

IV. Theological Usage.

1. Within the narrative pentateuchal texts, Ex. 19:9 can hardly be viewed as preexilic. The dating of Gen. 6:3f. depends on the one hand on the age of the material used here, and on the other on the question whether one ascribes it to the Yahwist and when one dates the Yahwist. This also applies to Gen. 3:22; 21:33(?);[46] and Ex. 14:13. With regard to the land promise *'aḏ-'ôlām* in Gen. 13:15, one must note that this text, if it is indeed old, is thematically isolated, or that similar statements (Ex. 32:13; Josh. 14:9; Ezr. 9:12; 2 Ch. 28:8; Ps. 37:27-29) derive from a later period (cf. also the discussion below of the significance of *'ôlām* in P). Jer. 25:5f. is of interest by way of contrast.

The significance of this possession of the land "forever" is also addressed thematically in the similarly non(!)-preexilic texts 2 Ch. 20:7; Isa. 34:17; 61:7; Jer. 7:7; 25:5; Ezk. 37:25; Joel 4:20(3:20).

2. Older texts among the historical books probably include 1 S. 1:21; 20:15,23; 2 S. 3:28; 2 K. 5:27. Later texts, i.e., largely Deuteronomistic redactional strata, include Josh. 4:7; 14:9; Jgs. 2:1; 2 S. 2:30; 3:13f.; 7:13,16,24,25,26,29; 1 K. 1:31; 2:33,45; 9:3,5; 10:9; 21:7; also Josh. 24:2(?); the use of *'ôlām* clearly increases within these late texts. Even a cursory glance at these later texts shows that they refer largely to the "eternal" duration of the Davidic dynasty, an OT theme quite frequently addressed through use of *'ôlām* (+ *le* or *'aḏ*).

One might mention first the greeting to the king, usually a variation of "May my lord King David live forever!" (1 K. 1:31; Neh. 2:3; Dnl. 2:4; 3:9; 5:10; 6:7,22[6,21]; cf. Ps. 21:5[4]; 61:7f.[6f.]; 110:4; cf. also 1 K. 3:11,14; Ps. 72:5; 18:51[50] par.; 45:3,7, 18[2,6,17]; 72:17; 89:5,37f.[4,36f.]). One should not make too much of this greeting, however.[47] Rather than a deification of the king, this is much more likely merely the wish

---

43. See K. Koch, "Denn seine Güte währet ewiglich," *EvT* 21 (1961) 531-44.
44. In this regard see S. Kreuzer, *Der lebendige Gott. BWANT* 116 (1983) 141f.
45. See IV below.
46. See 3 below.
47. Contra Jenni, *ZAW* 65 (1953) 5ff.

that he might live as long as possible and "well." This greeting/wish is part of courtly style (esp. at the Persian court? cf. the accumulation of occurrences in Daniel).[48]

In the promises to David and to the Davidic dynasty, *'ôlām* is again used in its typical role as amplification and intensification (cf. already to Saul, 1 S. 13:13). This is itself then theologically developed into the → *b^{e}rîṯ 'ôlām* applying to the Davidic dynasty (1 S. 20:42; 2 S. 7:13,16; cf. vv. 24f.,29; then 23:5, *b^{e}rîṯ;* cf. also 1 K. 2:33,45; 2 S. 22:51 par. Ps. 18:51[50]; 1 K. 8:25; 9:4f.; 10:9; Isa. 9:6[7]; 55:3 [cf. in this regard 2 Ch. 9:8 expanded to include Israel itself]; also 1 Ch. 17:12,14,22-24,27; 2 Ch. 22:10; 28:4; Ps. 89:3-5,29,37f.[2-4,28,36f.]; 45:3,7,18[2,6,17]; 132:11f.; Ezk. 37:25f.). This obviously involves a typical Deuteronomistic theologoumenon and its subsequent influence.[49]

The Priestly document speaks analogously about a *b^{e}rîṯ 'ôlām,* but refers it to the patriarchal *b^{e}rîṯ* (cf. Ps. 105:8,10 par. 1 Ch. 16:15,17; in a more general sense probably in Ps. 11:5,9).[50] Concerning the *b^{e}rîṯ 'ôlām,* cf. also the early witness from Arslan Tash, expanded in Isa. 24:5.[51]

One additional, small, and probably also more recent textual group qualifies the time of David as an ideal age and then speaks of it as the *y^{e}mê 'ôlām* (Neh. 12:46; Am. 9:11; Mic. 5:1[2]; cf. also Isa. 45:21; 46:10; 63:9,11; Mic. 7:14; Mal. 3:4).

3. Gen. 21:33 mentions an *'ēl 'ôlām* whose veneration is tied to Beer-sheba.[52] Here *'ôlām* is to be translated as "mighty in perpetuity," leading to the divine title "eternal one," which especially in extrabiblical witnesses is often intimately connected with this deity's "kingship."[53] Divine names (e.g., *šmš* or *šḥr*) are often used together with *'ôlām.*[54]

Regarding the OT in general, the following texts are also of interest: Dt. 32:40; 33:27; Ps. 9:6,8[5,7]; 10:16; 66:7; 145:13;[55] 146:10; Isa. 26:4; 33:14; 63:16; Lam.

---

48. See EA, 21:22f., 39; 149:24ff. Cf. also H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 285; → IV, 335f.

49. Cf. T. Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie. AnAcScFen* B 193 (1975); concerning the promises with *'ôlām* and *b^{e}rîṯ 'ôlām,* see also M. Tsevat, "Studies in the Book of Samuel," *HUCA* 34 (1963) 71-77.

50. → זכר *zkr* (IV, 64-82); see 7 below.

51. *KAI,* 27:9f. (*ANET,* 658), with *'lt* and → כרת *krt* (VII, 339-52), as the verb; cf. Dt. 29:11. Cf. also M. S. Smith, "*Bĕrît 'am / Bĕrît 'ôlām:* A New Proposal for the Crux of Isa 42:6," *JBL* 100 (1981) 241-43.

52. Cf. Jenni, *ZAW* 65 (1953) 1ff.; O. Eissfeldt, "*'äh^{e}yäh ^{a}šär 'äh^{e}yäh* und *'Ēl 'ôlām,*" *KlSchr* 4 (1968), 193-98; and → I, 242ff.

53. Cf. Ahiqar, saying 13, 7:95? (broken text); Sir. 36:22.

54. Cf. F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," *JBL* 67 (1948) 201f.; Jenni, *TLOT,* II, 858, with bibliography. Cf. in this regard also *KAI,* 26A III:19, and in general *KAI,* II, 43; Jenni, *ZAW* 64 (1952) 208f.; *KTU,* 3.5, 15; 2.42, 7; then *KTU,* 1, 108, 1; and A. Cooper, *RSP,* III, 466, no. 41. Concerning the combination (God-) king and "eternal one," cf. also Dahood, *RSP,* I, 266, no. 363; in general cf. W. H. Schmidt, *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel. BZAW* 80 (^{2}1966), 53f.; J. Woźiniak, "Ugaritic Parallel of *Jahwe melek 'ôlām,*" *Folia orientalia* 20 (Cracow, 1979) 171ff.

55. Cf. *KTU,* 1.2, IV, 10.

5:19; Dnl. 2:44; 3:33[4:3]; 4:31[34], here, too, liturgical courtly style; also Ex. 15:18; Ps. 29:10; 66:7; Jer. 10:10; Mic. 4:7b. In connection with the special meaning of *'ôlām* ascertained in Deutero-Isaiah,[56] one should also mention Isa. 40:28, which refers to Yahweh as *'elōhê 'ôlām;* this is not, however, really identical with Gen. 21:33 (or with Dt. 33:7), nor should it be interpreted from that perspective. Context suggests rather that Yahweh is conceived here as the God and Lord of creation, i.e., perhaps already of the "world."[57]

This thematic group ("eternal God"; *'ôlām* as divine title) also includes Ps. 90:2; 92:8f.(7f.); 102:12f.(11f.), perhaps also 75:10(9), and, if 31:2(1); 71:1; 86:12 (and elsewhere as well?) do indeed contain vocative *lamed,* these texts as well (as references to *'ôlām* as divine title).

4. In Deuteronomy *le'ôlām* or *'aḏ 'ôlām* is used within Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic parenesis again as an amplifying motivation (5:29 and 12:28; cf. also 23:4,7[3,6]). Concerning *tēl 'ôlām* in 13:17, cf. Josh. 8:28 (both of which are Deuteronomistic); concerning 15:17 (slave for life), cf. III above. That which is revealed in Deuteronomy applies to Israel *'aḏ 'ôlām* (29:28[29]).

Dt. 28:46 uses *'ôlām* to strengthen an imprecation; in this regard see also 2 S. 12:10; 1 K. 2:33a, as well as the prophetic oracles of judgment, often with content similar to that of imprecations[58] (cf. also Jer. 7:20; 17:27; 25:12).

5. Prophetic oracles of judgment and salvation are also enhanced by *'ôlām.* This prevents the predicted judgment or good fortune from being associated with only short duration, and gives it instead a more abiding or enduring character. Oracles of judgment of this sort include (in addition to 2 S. 12:10; 2 K. 5:27) Isa. 14:20; 25:2; 32:14; 34:10; cf. 30:8; then Mic. 2:9; Ob. 10, though probably only Mic. 2:9 and Ob. 10 are authentic.

Especially in the judgment oracles of Jeremiah (17:4; 18:16; 20:11; cf. 3:5; 25:9; Ps. 78:66), though also in those of later (Deuteronomistic) redactors of this book (Jer. 10:10; 23:40; 33:11; 49:13,33; 50:5; 51:26,39,57,62), *'ôlām* underscores a certain element of finality attaching to such judgment. If this aspect of finality is indeed viewed as being constitutive for the disputed "eschatology" of the OT, one can say that *'ôlām* acquires new content here insofar as it increasingly comes to characterize Yahweh's own eschatological acts.[59] Other texts include Ezk. 27:36; 28:19; 35:9; 36:2; Zeph. 2:9.

Prophetic oracles of salvation (whose authenticity will not be discussed here) use *'ôlām* analogously (Isa. 9:6[7]; 32:17; 34:17; 35:10; Jer. 3:12; 17:25; 25:12; Hos. 2:21[19]; Am. 9:11f.; Mic. 4:5,7; 5:1[2]). Isa. 58:12 and 61:4 (cf. by contrast Jer. 18:16; 25:9,[12]; 49:13,33; 51:26) show that the "everlasting desolations/ruins" threat-

---

56. See 6 below.

57. Cf. C. North, *The Second Isaiah* (Oxford, 1964), 89f. See IV below.

58. Cf. 5 below.

59. With Jenni, *ZAW* 65 (1953) 14. Concerning this, cf. H. D. Preuss, ed., *Eschatologie im AT. WdF* 480 (1978); R. Smend, "Eschatologie II: AT," *TRE,* X, 256-64.

ened in the book of Jeremiah are sufficiently equivocal that they can be offset by a renewed promise of reestablishment.

6. It is questionable whether the history of the word reaches a genuinely new stage in the 15 occurrences in Deutero-Isaiah.[60] Isa. 40:8; 45:17; 51:6,8; 54:8 (cf. also 47:7; 55:13) all use *'ôlām* to express the element of "forever" already expressed earlier and elsewhere as well. The plural in 51:9 (as often the case in Deutero-Isaiah, the pl. signals no conceptual change) refers to the distant past and yet at the same time demythologizes that past through a parallel use of the struggle with the → *rahab̲* and the crossing of the sea during the liberation from Egypt; the reference is no longer to a mythical primal age (cf. 42:14, "for a long time"; 46:9; 44:7 corr. "from the beginning").[61] An analysis of Deutero-Isaiah's use of *'ôlām* alone, however, cannot demonstrate that this writer is now concerned with eschatological, inbreaking, and goal-oriented salvation rather than only with continuing desolation.

When Isa. 40:28 refers to Yahweh as *'elōhê 'ôlām,*[62] one might ask whether this title is not really already referring to Yahweh as "king of the world" (cf. Jer. 10:10), and whether the meaning of the lexeme *'ôlām* does not seem to be changing here into what clearly becomes its meaning in postexilic texts, especially in apocalyptic writing ("world": cf. also Ps. 104:5; 148:6).

7. P tends to use *'ôlām* frequently and in theologically significant combinations.[63] With reference to the land itself, it speaks of "perpetual holding" (*'ᵃḥuzzat̲ 'ôlām,* Gen. 17:8; 48:4; Lev. 25:34; one Ugaritic witness already attests a gift "in perpetuity/eternally");[64] then also of *gᵉ'ullat̲ 'ôlām* (Lev. 25:32), *dôrôt̲ 'ôlām* (Gen. 9:12), *kᵉhunnat̲ 'ôlām* (Ex. 40:15; Nu. 25:13; cf. also 1 Ch. 15:2; 2 Ch. 23:13; Ps. 110:4;[65] according to 1 S. 2:30 and 3:13f., however, this priesthood "forever" may well come to an end), and *'ôt̲ lᵉ'ôlām* (Ex. 31:17; cf. Isa. 55:13; Gen. 9:12; only in Ex. 31:17 and Lev. 25:46 does P use *'ôlām* with *lᵉ* within construct combinations; P never uses *'ad̲ 'ôlām*). It is also important for P that Yahweh's statutes and ordinances *(ḥōq* or *ḥuqqâ,* → חקק *ḥqq)* are everlasting (Ex. 29:9,28; 30:21; Lev. 3:17; 6:11,15[18,23]; 7:34,36; 10:9,15; 16:29, 31,34; 17:3; 23:14,21,31,41; 24:3,9; Nu. 10:8; 18:8,11,19,23; 19:10,21; cf. Ex. 12:14, 17,24; Ezk. 46:14; 2 Ch. 2:3[4]).[66]

It is of particular significance that P transfers the *bᵉrît̲ 'ôlām* to the Noachic *bᵉrît̲* (Gen. 9:16; cf. v. 12) and especially to the patriarchal *bᵉrît̲* (Gen. 17:7,13,19; Ex.

---

60. So Jenni, *ZAW* 65 (1953) 15.

61. Concerning the recasting of the Davidic *bᵉrît̲* to refer to the people (Isa. 55:3), see IV.2.

62. Cf. IV.3 above.

63. Cf. Jenni, *ZAW* 64 (1952) 240f.; 65 (1953) 21f.; idem, *TLOT,* II, 857, 861; C. Feucht, *Untersuchungen zum Heiligkeitsgesetz* (Berlin, 1964), 59; C. Levin, *Die Verheissung des neuen Bundes. FRLANT* 137 (1985), 222ff. According to Levin (231), P is targeting the Jewish Diaspora of the fourth century!

64. *KTU,* 3.5, 14, 15, 20; see also *TUAT,* I/3, 212.

65. Cf. F. B Knutson, *RSP,* II, 407ff., no. 3.

66. See also V, 144.

31:16; Lev. 24:8; also Nu. 18:19, "*b^erîṯ* of salt" with *'ôlām*). In Deuteronomistic literature and in writers influenced by it, this covenant was reserved for David and for the Davidic dynasty.[67] Similarly, the special theological interest in the longevity of this *b^e rîṯ*, one interpreted largely as a gift and promise, is underscored by P's inclination to amplify these construct combinations by adding words that in their own turn underscore this longevity yet again, e.g., → זרע *zera'*, → דור *dôr* (or its pl.), or *bānîm*. These are then explicated by the expression "after you" (cf., e.g., Gen. 17:7-9) precisely because P has a special theological interest in underscoring the validity of these divine salvific promises for Abraham's "descendants."

With regard to the use of *b^e rîṯ 'ôlām* in P, one might also compare the following (in addition to those mentioned in IV.2): Ps. 105:10 (cf. v. 8); Isa. 24:5; 61:8; Jer. 32:40; 50:5; Ezk. 16:60, then also Jgs. 2:1, though the "breaking" of the *b^e rîṯ 'ôlām* (!) in Deuteronomistic theology and terminology refers to the Sinaitic *b^e rîṯ*.

In these examples P is concerned not only with that which remains perpetually the same[68] but even more with what continues to remain valid, i.e., with that which will also apply to the "descendants."

8. Postexilic texts inquire whether Yahweh's wrath, now manifest in the punishment of the exile, will continue or even go on "forever" (Ps. 77:8[7]; 85:6[5]; 103:9; Isa. 57:16; cf. already Lam. 3:31).[69] They ask about the future (Isa. 56:5; 58:12; 59:21; 61:4) and try to promise new, enduring salvation (60:15-22; 61:7f.; also 35:10; 51:11; 32:17; see in this regard Joel 2:26f.). The threats of perdition for other nations ultimately also involve the resultant salvation for Israel "forever" (Isa. 14:20; 25:2; 34:10; Ob. 10; Mal. 1:4; cf. Ps. 9:8[7]).

9. In the Psalms the expressions *l^e'ôlām* or *'aḏ 'ôlām* (and the combination with *mē'ôlām*) appear first of all in the doxologies that organize the book of Psalms itself (Ps. 41:14[13]; 72:19; 89:53[52]; 106:48).[70] These expressions could be appropriated into these doxologies precisely because they were already being used particularly in doxological or hymnic language or in strongly assertoric discourse in any case (5:12[11]; 9:8[7]; 30:13[12]; 33:11; 44:9[8]; 52:10f.[8f.]; 75:10[9]; 79:13; 81:16[15]; 89:2,3[1,2]; 90:2; 92:9[8]; 93:2; 102:13[12]; 104:31; 106:48; 111:8; 113:2; 115:18; 119:44,93,98,111f.; 125:2; 131:3; 135:13; 145:1f.,13,21). Concerning this "everlasting praise,"[71] cf. also Dt. 33:27; Neh. 9:5; 1 Ch. 16:36; 29:10; Isa. 26:4; Dnl. 2:20; 3:33 [4:3]; 4:31[34]; 6:7, etc.

It is particularly Yahweh's → חסד *ḥeseḏ* and his *'^e meṯ*[72] that have been in effect

---

67. See IV.2 above.
68. So Jenni, *ZAW*, 65 (1953), 21; idem, *TLOT*, II, 861.
69. See Jenni, *ZAW* 65 (1953) 18ff.; idem, *TLOT*, II, 859ff.
70. Cf. Jenni, *TLOT*, II, 860.
71. Cf. W. Beyerlin, "Kontinuität beim 'berichtenden' Lobpreis des Einzelnen," *Wort und Geschichte. FS K. Elliger. AOAT* 18 (1973), 17-24.
72. → אמן *'mn* (I, 292-323).

"from of old" and are thus praised, or that at least are enduringly hoped for and thus praised in the confidence that they will indeed be granted (Ps. 25:6; 33:11; 89:3[2]; 100:5; 103:17; 105:8,10; 111:5,8f.; 117:2; 119:89,142,144,152,160; 125:2; 135:13; 138:8; 146:6; 148:6; 136; then 1 Ch. 16:34,36,41; 2 Ch. 5:13; 7:3,6; 20:21; Ps. 106:1; 107:1; 118:1,2-4,29; Jer. 33:11).

Then it is Zion, which has existed "since of old" and will continue to do so forever, that is praised for its longevity; after all, Yahweh has indeed taken up residence there "forever" or has set his name on Zion and made it its resting place (1 Ch. 23:25; 2 Ch. 30:8; 33:4,7; Ps. 48:9,15[8,14]; 78:69; 125:1; 133:3; cf. 1 K. 8:13; 9:3; then also Ps. 31:4[3]; 42:10[9]; Isa. 26:2-4; Jer. 31:40; Ezk. 37:26,28; 43:7,9; cf. 2 Ch. 6:2; 7:16; Jer. 7:7).[73]

Ps. 119 demonstrates anew that the use of *'ôlām* (with *l^e^*, *'ad*, and *min*) in many texts functions (merely) as an amplification. The psalmist intends "forever" to follow and reflect on Yahweh's → תורה *tôrâ*, his → דבר *dāḇār* (or pl.), and his → משפט *mišpāṭ* (pl.; also *miṣwâ* and *'ēḏûṯ*), since all these things are themselves established "in perpetuity"; they will always be valid ordinances (cf. vv. 44,52,89,93,98,111,112,142,144, 152,160).

Finally, numerous petitioners confess confidently that they (as righteous, faithful, etc.) will be guided "forever," will neither vacillate nor come to shame[74] (cf. 15:5; 30:7[6]; 31:2[1]; 37:18,27; 41:13[12]; 55:23[22]; 61:5,8[4,7]; 71:1; 73:26; 112:6; 121:8; 125:1; 139:24); or they express similar petitions (1 Ch. 29:18; Ps. 12:8[7]; 28:9; 61:5[4]; 75:10[9]; 77:8[7]; 85:6[5]) with regard either to themselves or to adversaries who are to perish "forever" (9:6[5]; 37:28; 81:16[15][?]; cf. 73:12).

According to the act-consequence schema, the good and the righteous should "always" experience good fortune. This is confirmed by wisdom aphorisms (Prov. 10:25,30) and by the wisdom poem Ps. 37 (vv. 18,27-29), as well as by 41:13(12); 55:23(22); 112:6, whereas the "psalm of Job" (Ps. 73) brings the opposite experience to expression (v. 12).[75]

10. The unique use of *'ôlām* in Ecclesiastes also belongs in the critical discussion of the wisdom tradition (also as an experienced tradition) as expressed in Prov. 10:25,30, etc.[76] Although Eccl. 1:4 does indeed already use *l^e^'ôlām* in the customary sense of "forever" (cf. 2:16; 9:6, though both times negated), the context clearly shows the criti-

---

73. → שם *šēm;* → נוח *nûaḥ;* → ישב *yšb* (VI, 420-38).

74. → בוש *bôš (bôsh)* (II, 50-60); → מוט *mwṭ* (VIII, 152-58).

75. Cf. also M. Perani, "Sulla terminologia temporale nel libro di Giobbe," *Henoch* 5 (1983) 1-20.

76. See the ending of IV.9. Cf. Jenni, *ZAW* 65 (1953) 22f.; idem, *TLOT,* II, 861 (in the latter's bibliog., the excursus by Ellermeier is of particular importance in this regard); cf. also M. Dahood, "Canaanite-Phoenician Influence in Qoheleth," *Bibl* 33 (1952) 216; idem, "The Language of Qoheleth," *CBQ* 14 (1952) 232; idem, "Qoheleth and Recent Discoveries," *Bibl* 39 (1958) 316. Also Gerleman, 341f.; and W. Zimmerli, "'Unveränderbare Welt' oder 'Gott ist Gott'? Ein Plädoyer für die Unaufgebarkeit des Predigerbuches in der Bibel," *"Wenn nicht jetzt, wann denn?" FS H.-J. Kraus* (Neukirchen, 1983), 108f.

cal intention of this statement; i.e., life goes on "perpetually" in the same way (cf. 1:5ff.), which is why there is really nothing new under the sun, no possibility for change, no chance to escape the present course of events. Eccl. 1:10 says precisely the same thing; here the expression *l^e'ôlāmîm* is accordingly to be viewed as an intensive plural rather than as a succession of ages.[77] That is, everything has already been this way once, and this is why the present offers little of particular interest. In the future both the wise and the foolish will be forgotten (2:16; cf. 9:6 after 9:5).

Within the occurrences of *'ôlām* in Ecclesiastes, 12:5 is of special significance. This is the only time in the OT that *'ôlām* is used with a suffix, and only here does *'ôlām* clearly mean "grave" (NRSV "eternal home"), though cf. Ps. 29:12(11). Jenni, however, has shown that this particular meaning was common in texts from the OT environs (cf., e.g., the Ahiram inscription).[78]

One must interpret *hā'ōlām* in Eccl. 3:11 within the context of the other occurrences in Ecclesiastes.[79] Accordingly, one should guard against an overly hasty comparison with Gen. 1:26ff. Similarly, Eccl. 3:14 can merely underscore that v. 11 in its own turn is saying that the "duration" of which God has made human beings aware is not nor can it be a consciousness of human existence as such, but rather again the experience of the torment of existence as a burden through the passing of time and through the experience of the burdensome, inaccessible, and incessant nature of existence. This means that 3:11 also involves a critical (!) response to the customary view of human beings, but with no positive counterview.[80]

11. The book of Daniel contains 5 occurrences in Hebrew (9:24; 12:2[bis],3,7), 18 in Aramaic (2:4,20[bis],44[bis]; 3:9,33[4:3]; 4:31[34][bis]; 5:10; 6:7,22,27[6,21,26]; 7:14,18[ter],27), of which 9:24 (Hebrew) and 2:4,44; 3:9; 5:10; 6:7,22,27[6,21,26] (Aramaic) as well as one of the occurrences in 7:18 are plural. Dnl. 2:4; 3:9; 5:10; 6:22(21) belong to the royal greetings (cf. also 6:7[6]).[81] Dnl. 2:44; 3:33(4:3); 4:31(34), and 6:27(26) also make clear that the concern here (as in the book of Daniel in the larger sense) is not only with the coming divine rule "forever," but also with extolling the present and future rule as being perpetual.

The assertion that "everlasting righteousness" (9:24) will be brought to the people and city (cf. 11QPs^a 16) then focuses more unequivocally on the new future, and Dnl. 2:44; 7:14,18; 12:2f. make clear that, and how, the present "age of the world" will end and the new age (this age, too, as a final one!) will commence. At that time "many" will be raised to "everlasting life" (12:2), others to everlasting shame and contempt. Resurrection thus functions here as a solution to the problem of theodicy and as an in-

---

77. With Ellermeier contra Jenni.

78. Jenni, *ZAW* 65 (1953) 27ff.; idem, *TLOT,* II, 861f. See *KAI,* 1:1, though also *KAI,* II, 3 in loc.; cf. I above.

79. → VII, 420f.

80. So with Ellermeier contra Jenni and Zimmerli; cf. also M. Filipiak, "Kairologie dans Ecl. 3,1-15," *Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne* 20/1 (1973) 83-93.

81. See IV.2 above.

strument for balancing things out between the good and the wicked, neither of whom will or may be permitted to end with death only.[82] Here *'ôlām/'ālam* acquires the meaning of "world/age of the world" (cf. already Ps. 104:5; 148:6? Isa. 40:28?), something then developed further in early Jewish literature.[83]

V. Apocrypha, Early Judaism, Qumran.

1. Among the Apocrypha,[84] the book of Sirach is of particular importance given its original Hebrew version. Although the text of Sir. 1:1,4, which speaks of wisdom as having been "forever" or from God (cf. Prov. 8:22-30), is extant only in its Greek translation, the actual Hebrew corpus of Sirach contains 40 occurrences of *'ôlām,* most of which can be classified under the meanings and uses already discussed above with regard to the OT.[85]

In Sirach *'ôlām* first of all (and in various combinations, e.g., with *ḥōq*) has the meaning "enduring, everlasting" (11:33; 14:17; 15:6; 16:13; 30:17 [sleep]; 41:9 [ms. B]; 43:6 [ms. B]; 44:13; 45:13; 47:11; 49:12; 51:30c; concerning 44:7, cf. Ex. 28:43). It is uncertain whether occasionally or even in general this notion of "everlasting" already implies a genuinely eschatological "eternal." In any event 37:26 (analogous to Dnl. 12:2) speaks about "living forever";[86] Sir. 43:6 also uses *'ôlām* together with → קץ *qēṣ,* and 7:36 together with → אחרית *'aḥ^a^rîṯ.*

Referring back to Gen. 17, Sir. 44:18 mentions the *'ôṯ 'ôlām* instead of the *b^e^rîṯ,* whereas 45:15 (cf. 45:24 and Nu. 25:12-13a) refers the *b^e^rîṯ 'ôlām* to the priestly covenant for Aaron and Phinehas.[87]

In 4:23 *'ôlām* refers in a general sense to "time," in 42:18 [M]; 48:25; 51:30 to the "future" (= "eternity"?), which according to 48:25 was revealed to Isaiah, and in 39:20 probably to the "age of the world." In 3:18 (ms. A) *'ôlām* means something like "world,"[88] and the *'ēl 'ôlām* in 36:22 B (though this is textually uncertain) is more likely the "God of the Cosmos [NRSV 'of the ages']" (cf. 36:1) than the "eternal God."[89] Sir. 42:21 is probably comparable in this respect ("he is from all eternity"; cf. 51:8), though here, too, it is difficult to determine whether the reference is not (only) to the expression "since an earlier period" (cf. 16:7; 44 S; 44:2; 48:25). In all this, Sirach stands clearly in a transitional situation with regard to the development of the term *'ôlām,* with traditional meanings continuing, new ones announcing themselves, and

82. Cf. in this regard H. D. Preuss, "'Auferstehung' in Texten alttestamentlicher Apokalyptik," *"Linguistische" Theologie,* ed. U. Gerber and E. Güttgemanns (Bonn, 1972), 101-33.

83. See V; concerning Daniel, cf. C. Barth, 82ff.; K. Koch et al., *Das Buch Daniel. EdF* 144 (1980), 214ff.

84. Cf. Jenni, *ZAW* 65 (1953) 29-35; idem, *TLOT,* II, 862.

85. Cf. in general O. Rickenbacher, *Weisheitsperikopen bei Ben Sira. OBO* 1 (1973), 22ff.; H. Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter. WUNT* II/6 (1980), 149ff.

86. Concerning this combination, however, cf. also Dahood, *RSP,* III, 126, no. 239.

87. Cf. Stadelmann.

88. See IV.11 above concerning Daniel.

89. See IV above.

many texts clearly hovering between the old and the new and thus eluding unequivocal determination.

2. In early Jewish literature the use of *'ôlām* (and its derivatives) tends increasingly to imply the opposition first attested in the book of Daniel (and prepared by several other OT texts that use *'ôlām* to mean "world"?)[90] between "this world" and the "coming world." In Greek texts this development is found in Wis. 13:9; Tob. 3:2 S; 13:18 (LXX^{BA}); cf. Sir. 3:18 (ms. A).[91]

3. Finally, the Qumran writings show convincingly that and how the use of *'ôlām* increases in postexilic and early Jewish literature.[92] In addition to the almost 170 occurrences in the texts accessible earlier, one can now add almost 30 occurrences from the Temple Scroll. (Fragmentary witnesses with textual lacunae, etc. [e.g., 1QH 1:3,7f.; cf. Prov. 8:23?; 1QH 3:4; 12:29] will not be considered here.) Citations are involved in 4QFlor (4Q174) 1:3 (Ex. 15:18) and 1:4 (Dt. 23:4ff.[3ff.]). Both 1QM (excepting col. 7) and 1QS 2–4 use *'ôlām* in the plural much more frequently than does the OT and much more frequently even than do the other Qumran texts, though no semantic change seems discernible.

As in the OT, *(l^e) 'ôlām* oftens means "forever" (1QSb 5:21; 1QH 1:24; 9:29; 14:23; 1QM 11:14; 12:16; 4Q171 [4QpPs 37] 3:2; etc.), which when negated means "never" (4Q504 [4QDibHam^a] 4:4; 6:11). In 1QM 7:4 one can then translate *'ôlām* as "perpetually." As is the case in the OT, it also occurs together with *dôr* (4QDibHam 2:11) or with the subst. *'aḏ* (1QS 4:1; 1QSb 3:21; 1QH 13:6,13; 17:28); the meaning "from everlasting to everlasting" also occurs here (4QDibHam 6:10; 1QS 2:1; etc.). Here, too, the combination with → קדם *qeḏem* refers to a distant, primal past (CD 2:7; 1QH 13:1,10), then within the faith of the group itself refers to the divine counsel taken in this "primal period."

In many instances *'ôlām* in construct combinations again functions to add emphasis or amplification; these combinations remain largely within the broader confines of the linguistic models already attested in the OT itself (eternal covenant, possession, peace, joy, loyalty, glory, etc.; 1QS 2:3,4,8; 4:3,7; 8:10; 9:4; 10:4; 11:7; 1QSb 1:3; 2:25,28; 3:4,5; 4:3; 1QH 1:18; 3:18,20,21; 6:11,31 [cf. Ps. 24:7]; 9:25f.; 13:5f.,18; 14:6; 18:6,15; CD 1:15 [cf. Hab. 3:6]; 3:4,13; 15:5; etc.). Mention of the "everlasting priestly covenant" (1QM 17:3) similarly draws on the OT model.[93]

The construct combinations with *'ôlām* that are new in comparison with those in the

---

90. See IV.11 above.

91. Jenni, *ZAW* 65 (1953) 29ff., thoroughly discusses all the pertinent witnesses; cf. also C. Barth; St.-B., IV/2, 799-976; and H. Merklein, *Die Gottesherrschaft als Handlungsprinzip. FzB* 34 (1978), 112ff.; concerning 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra, see W. Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheissung der Geschichte. FRLANT* 97 (^{2}1969), 90ff.

92. Cf. Jenni, *ZAW* 64 (1952) 247f.; idem, *TLOT*, II, 862; Barr, 67, 118; A. Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer. SBM* 12 (1971) 161f.

93. See IV.7 above.

OT itself clearly show that these combinations have a stronger eschatological focus than in the OT, and that they are used far more frequently in precisely such contexts and for precisely this reason in the Qumran texts. Hence one reads not only about eternal rule for Israel (1QM 19:8) but also about eternal help, deliverance, or redemption (1QM 12:7; 15:1; 18:1,11,12) or eternal destruction of adversaries (1QM 1:5; 9:6; 18:1; 4Q171 3:13). Reference is made to everlasting destiny (1QH 3:22), fire (1QS 2:8), those who are cursed forever (2:17), everlasting ruin and destruction (4:12; 5:13), everlasting light (4:8; 1QH 7:25; 12:15; 1QM 13:6; etc.), an everlasting path (1QH 4:4); cf., e.g., the accumulation of occurrences in 1QS 4:7f.

Whereas the hymnic-doxological use again finds its precursor in the OT itself (1QS 10:12; 11:5; 1QH 1:31; 11:25,27; 17:20; 1QM 13:7), one particular group of texts demonstrates an interest in the problems of "time" within the Qumran group itself (1QSb 4:26; 5:18; CD 13:8; 2:10; 1QM 12:3; 14:13; 1QS 4:16; cf. also the frequent "everlasting beings/happenings": 1QS 11:4; cf. CD 2:10; 13:8; 1QH 18:27; 1QM 17:5). As the context shows, an *'ēl 'ôlām* then also exhibits a different meaning (1QH 7:31).[94]

The Qumran texts use *'ôlām* as a linguistic means of expression in connection with both angelology (1QH 1:11) and anthropology (1QH 1:15) as well as with the dualism typical of Qumran (1QS 4:1,17; 9:21).

Finally, the lexeme also occupies a unique place within the numerous self-designations and self-qualifications of the Qumran community itself (everlasting knowledge, counsel, order, assembly, community of the everlasting covenant, everlasting planting, everlasting building with everlasting foundations and at an everlasting spring, etc.; cf. 1QS 2:23,25; 3:12; 4:16,22; 5:5f.; 8:5; 11:8; 1QH 3:35; 6:15; 1QM 17:8; 1QS 2:3; 1QM 13:9; also 1QH 3:21; 8:6,8,12,14,20; 6:17f.,10,31).[95] Accordingly, *'ôlām* serves in a larger sense both to express the generally intense eschatological faith of the Qumran community and to qualify this group itself as an eschatological entity.[96]

The use of *'ôlām* in the Temple Scroll adds nothing to these findings. Virtually all the occurrences here follow OT usage, and show only that this text was particularly interested in the "everlasting ordinances"[97] and in confirming that especially the cultic regulations regarding, e.g., the altar or temple in the larger sense, as well as divine promises regarding it (45:14), are valid "forever" (8:13; 9:14; 17:3; 18:8; 19:9; 20:14; 21:04,05? 23:01? 24:8; 25:8; 27:4; 29:7f.; 35:9; 45:14; 46:3? 47:3; 50:19; 53:7; 55:10; 59:15,18).

Preuss

---

94. Cf. IV.3 above.

95. → סוד *sôḏ;* → יחד *yaḥaḏ* (VI, 40-48).

96. Cf. H.-W. Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil. SUNT* 4 (1966); cf. there also the index s.v. *'ôlām;* also Beyer (see I above) and H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde. SUNT* 15 (1980), index s.v. *'ôlām.*

97. A favorite use in P; see IV.7 above.

עָוֹן *'āwōn;* עָוָה *'āwâ;* עַוָּה *'awwâ;* עִוְעִים *'iw'îm;* עִי *'î;* מְעִי *m^e'î;* Aram. עֲוָיָה *'^awāyâ*

Contents: I. Occurrences; Verb and Related Nouns. II. Meaning of the Verb and of Derivatives Except *'āwōn:* 1. Verb; 2. Derivatives. III. *'āwōn* in the Historical Books and Psalms: 1. Older Works; 2. Deuteronomistic Passages; 3. Chronicles; 4. Psalms. IV. *'āwōn* in the Prophets: 1. Preexilic; 2. Exilic. V. *'āwōn* in the Priestly Document. VI. Qumran. VII. Biblical Aramaic. VIII. LXX.

I. Occurrences; Verb and Related Nouns. Beginning with the exilic/postexilic period, the noun *'āwōn,* attested 231 times in the OT, became the central term for human sin, guilt, and fate in prophetic and cultic writings. It occurs most frequently in Ezekiel (44 times), then 31 times in the Psalms, 24 in Jeremiah, 15 in Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah, 27 in P, and 15 in Job. Of note are the relatively early multiple occurrences in Hosea (11 times).

Morphologically this form involves a construction with the "abstract" suffix *-ān.*[1] The plural occurs relatively rarely, largely (43 times) with the feminine ending as *'^awōnôṯ* (e.g., 5 times in Ezekiel), and only exceptionally with suffixes as masculine plural (5 times; once in Ezekiel).[2] M. Dahood classifies *'n* (with suf. *y*) in Ezk. 18:17 and Lam. 1:3 as a contracted northern Israelite variant.[3]

This form derives historically from the root *'wy/w.* The corresponding verb *'āwâ,* with only 17 occurrences, is attested relatively rarely, albeit from the older strata (e.g., 1 S. 20:30) onward to the Qumran writings. Roughly speaking, the semantic scope extends from "transgress, incur guilt, sin," toward human beings or God to "be distraught, destroyed."[4] Semantic specialization is discernible only in the case of the hiphil (9 occurrences), which is used in connection with the ritual confession of sin (see below).

Other nominal derivatives of the root such as *'î* (5 occurrences, usually pl.); *'awwâ* (3 times); *'iw'îm* (once + Sir. 37:31?), and *m^e'î* (once) recede even more (see below

---

'āwōn. R. Knierim, *Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde im AT* (Gütersloh, [2]1967), 185-256; idem, "עָוֹן *'āwōn* perversity," *TLOT,* II, 862-66; K. Koch, "Die ganzheitliche Wirklichkeitserfassung des alttestamentlichen Sündenbegriffs," *Parola e Spirito. FS S. Cipriani,* 2 vols. (Brescia, 1982), I, 585-98; C. A. Ben-Mordechai, "The Iniquity of the Sanctuary," *JBL* 60 (1941) 311-14; L. Rost, "Die Schuld der Väter," *Studien zum AT. BWANT* 101 (1974), 66-71; R. Youngblood, "A New Look at Three OT Roots for 'Sin,'" *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies. FS W. S. LaSor* (Grand Rapids, 1978), 201-5; → חטא *ḥāṭā' (chāṭā')* (IV, 309-19).

1. *BLe,* 498.
2. Cf. D. Michel, *Grundlegung einer hebräischen Syntax* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1977), I, 48f.
3. "Hebrew-Ugaritic Lexicography VII," *Bibl* 50 (1969) 351.
4. *GesB,* 569f.; *HAL,* II, 796.
5. *GesB,* 572.

concerning their content). In Hos. 10:10 the term עינת *ʿynt,* "furrows" according to the Targs. (*K* is meaningless), is today generally pointed as *ʿᵃwōnôṯ*.[5]

Apart from the use of the noun *ʿyn* in the Mesha inscription,[6] other occurrences of the root outside ancient Hebrew are uncertain. W. von Soden does adduce Akk. *iwītu(m),* "maliciously false assertion," deriving this noun from the verb *ewû(m)* II, which is attested at least once with "sin" *(arnu)* as its object and thus, in analogy to Hebrew, *ʿwy* would allegedly mean approximately "burden with."[7] *CAD* adduces but a single root *ewû,* "to change, turn into," and derives *iwītu(m)* from this without any connection to Hebrew.[8]

Influenced probably by Biblical Hebrew, both the verb and a noun *ʿᵃwāyâ* later established themselves in Biblical Aramaic (Dnl. 4:24[Eng. v. 27]), Jewish Aramaic, and Middle Hebrew, albeit in only a limited fashion. Significantly, the Targs. generally use Aram. *ḥôḇâ* in the singular or plural (Gen. 4:13; 15:16; 19:15, etc.) for Heb. *ʿāwōn.* By contrast, when dealing with a fixed cultic formula such as that in Lev. 16:21f., or when the central Aramaic term *ḥôḇâ* is needed contextually for a parallel expression such as Heb. *ḥaṭṭāʾṯ,* the translators are inclined to use Aram. *ʿᵃwāyâ* (Ex. 34:7). Although the Qumran writings make considerable use of both the verb and the noun *ʿāwōn* (7 and 40 times, respectively, according to Kuhn),[9] the noun is apparently subordinated to the similarly frequent *ʾšm/ʾšmh* as a new central term for sin or guilt (see below).

Influenced by the efforts of earlier lexicographers to derive every Hebrew word from a basic material meaning, *GesB* viewed *ʿwh* as a union of the two Arab. verbs *ʿwy,* "bend, turn," and *ġwy,* "deviate, err from the path."[10] The latter corresponds to Eth. *ʿawawa,* "err, stray, not know."[11] R. Knierim thus deduces a basic meaning of "bend, curve, turn aside, twist."[12] Even if this etymological derivation is correct, one still cannot determine whether any biblical writer was familiar with the original meaning.

In any event, the two "literal" passages adduced in support can also be understood differently. Although Ps. 38:7(6) can certainly be rendered "I am utterly bowed down," the rendering "I am utterly destroyed" would also fit contextually. And although it is certainly conceivable that according to Isa. 24:1 Yahweh will "twist" the countenance of the earth (Knierim), this nonetheless seems to weaken the statement's presumed intention of asserting that he will in fact make the surface of the earth uninhabitable. As with many other OT terms, here, too, etymological conjectures concerning a basic material meaning contribute little to our understanding.

Given the Arabic parallels, *BDB* distinguishes two different Hebrew roots.[13] The term *ʿwh* I, "to bend, twist," includes the derivatives *ʿawwâ, ʿiwʿîm,* and *ʿî.* Only *ʿāwōn* itself and the denominative qal and hiphil verbal forms derive from *ʿwh* II.

---

6. *KAI,* 181:27.
7. *AHw,* I, 266f., 408.
8. *CAD,* IV, 413ff.
9. Kuhn, 158.
10. *GesB,* 569.
11. *LexLingAeth,* 1008.
12. *TLOT,* II, 863.
13. *BDB,* 730.

II. Meaning of the Verb and of Derivatives Except *ʿāwōn*.

1. *Verb.* The basic stem of *ʿāwâ* is used to mean "to commit *ʿāwōn*" in only 2 late passages (Est. 1:16; Dnl. 9:5), prompting the question whether it might not derive from the noun.[14] The piel is similarly attested with but 2 exilic/postexilic occurrences, with a divine subject, asserting that Yahweh intends to make either the "surface of the earth" or its "ways" (= life paths) inaccessible for sinful humanity (Isa. 24:1; Lam. 3:9).[15]

The hiphil (9 occurrences) belongs to the language of penitential confessions and to the retrospective context of thanksgiving (with *šûḇ,* 1 K. 8:47 par. 2 Ch. 6:37; Jer. 3:21f.; cf. 4:9 LXX;[16] a context of thanksgiving in Job 33:27). Confessions traditionally order the triad *ḥāṭāʾṯî — heʿewêṯî — hiršaʿtî* (or pl.) (2 S. 24:17; 1 K. 8:47 par. 2 Ch. 6:37; Ps. 106:6; with *ʿāwâ* qal in Dnl. 9:5). It represents the expansion of the simpler form of the individual or collective admission of guilt before either human or divine authority, which can be expressed only with the verb *ḥāṭāʾ.*[17] This expansion of the formula can be explained such that *ḥāṭāʾ* refers to the sinful acts, with *heʿewâ* meaning "(thereby) incurring guilt" (hiphil "inwardly causative," but hardly merely "prove to be perverted")[18] and *hiršîaʿ,* "make oneself evil = incur an evil occurrence" (cf. the discussion below concerning the corresponding three nouns).

The niphal, occurring 4 times (and in Sir. 13:3), attests a vernacular usage relatively independent of the noun *ʿāwōn* itself. A petitioner whose *ʿawōnôṯ* have gone over his head finds himself "*naʿawâ* and prostrate" (Ps. 38:7[6]), with the first expression referring probably to being "oppressed (by guilt)." Whereas the house of the righteous will endure and they will be praised by all for their good sense, the wicked, who has "made his mind sinful/oppressed his heart," will be despised (Prov. 12:7f.). 1 S. 20:30 is difficult to interpret; Saul calls Jonathan's mother a *naʿawaṯ hammardûṯ,* which might mean "one who has become unhappy through rebelliousness" unless one follows suggested conjectures.[19] Only in Isa. 21:3 does the verb occur with no discernible connection with a guilty or sinful subject. Here the prophet moans that the pangs of a woman in labor have seized him and that he is "*naʿawîṯî* by hearing and dismayed by seeing" (NRSV "I am bowed down so that I cannot hear, I am dismayed so that I cannot see"). Here the rendering "distraught, distressed," is doubtless preferable to "I am dizzy."[20] It remains unclear, however, whether the prophet's own shattered condition has resulted from the sin and guilt of those whom he is to denounce and whether the judgment anticipated in his very person will not soon be visited even more severely on those people. If that is indeed the case, then no OT occurrence of this verb *ʿwh* is not at once also connected with some sort of guilty or sinful involvement. In any event, the use of the individual conjugation stems already shows that the root expresses a "dynamistic ho-

---

14. Cf. *GesB,* 569.
15. *GesB,* 570: "make impassable."
16. Cf. *BHS.*
17. Knierim, *Hauptbegriffe,* 20f., 28f.
18. Idem, *TLOT,* II, 862.
19. *BHK; KBL²,* 686f.
20. For the former see *HAL,* II, 796; for the latter, *GesB,* s.v.

listic thought" that tries to conceive in a single sweep "the various phases of a misdeed-consequence process (deed-consequence completion)."[21]

2. *Derivatives.* Other nominal derivatives (besides *'āwōn*) occur so isolated and so rarely in the OT that a more precise analysis is difficult. Three forms traditionally (and without further explication) are translated as "rubble, ruins." This is the case for *'î,* deriving from the basic stem and occurring 5 times (usually pl. *'îyîm* or aramaizing *'îyîn*), and for *m^e'î,* occurring only in Isa. 17:1 and not recognized by lexicons, but also for the intensive construction *'awwâ,* occurring 3 times in Ezk. 21:32(27).[22] The semantic distance from the alleged basic meaning "be bent, twisted" to a reference to ruins is admittedly considerable, especially if one postulates for *'î* a semantic development from "stone heaps . . . that mark fords across water channels in the desert" to the notion of a violently destroyed building.[23] Hence W. L. Moran derives both *'î* and *m^e'î* not from *'wy* but from an undocumented Hebrew root *'yy;* by contrast, he construes *'awwâ* as "twisting."[24] The reduplicative construction *'iw'îm,* attested only in Isa. 19:14, is consistently understood as "confusion, tumult."[25]

Contextually, all four derivatives refer to entities that have transgressed and incurred guilt. In the famous prophecy from Mic. 3:12 par. Jer. 26:18, Zion will be plowed as a field, Jerusalem will become *'îyîn,* and the temple mount a (cultic) high place; although the translation "heap of ruins" is certainly possible given the alternating imagery, it is equally conceivable that it might become a "place of perdition to be avoided," since the assertion was just made that the city itself had been built "with *'awlâ*" (Mic. 3:10). The rendering in Mic. 1:6 is more difficult; as a result of Jacob's *peša'* (v. 5), Yahweh will make Samaria a "*'î haśśāḏeh,* a place for planting vineyards," and will "pour down her stones into the valley." If the stones fall into the valley, then no ruins will remain on top. The suggested elimination of the construct combination merely reveals the embarrassment caused by the usual translation.[26] In Job 30:24 the traditional rendering ("yet he [God?] does not stretch out his hand in the *'î,* and in his disaster . . .") so clearly fails that, following A. Dillmann, the text is now generally severely emended.[27] This can be avoided if after the alternating image *pîḏ* one deduces "(self-incurred) disaster." J. Reider proposes a correspondence to Arab. *'ayy,* "weak," though this is otherwise unattested.[28] Ps. 79:1 laments that Jerusalem's enemies have turned it into *'îyîm,* and the parallel statement asserts that they have defiled the holy temple; vv. 5f. trace this back to God's own wrath. The coupling with *ṭāmē'* here as in

---

21. *TLOT,* II, 863f.

22. For *'î* see *GesB,* 581; *HAL,* II, 816; *BLe,* 517t; cf., however, Wagner, 135; M. Dahood, *RSP,* II, 31f., no. 61. For *m^e'î* see H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1997), 156. For *'awwâ* cf. *GesB,* 570; *HAL,* II, 797.

23. *HAL,* II, 816.

24. "Gen 49,10 and Its Use in Ez 21,32," *Bibl* 39 (1958) 420.

25. *GesB,* 572; *HAL,* II, 800 (abstract pl., Michel, *Grundlegung,* I, 88).

26. Cf., e.g., H. W. Wolff, *Micah* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1990), 42.

27. *GesB,* 581; *HAL,* II, 816; G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 414.

28. "Etymological Studies in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 2 (1952) 129.

Mic. 3:12 suggests a meaning related to *'āwōn.* Finally, with regard to *'awwâ* in Ezk. 21:32(27), the suffix of the attendant verb *'aśîmennâ* suggests a feminine entity. This can hardly be a reference to the rather distantly mentioned (v. 27) Jerusalem, nor to an unreferenced neuter,[29] but more likely to the turban and crown (both fem. in Hebrew) of the *nāśî'* (v. 29) marked by *'āwōn,* both of which are mentioned in the preceding verse. The beneficial function of these royal insignia will in the future be distorted into their opposite; they will become a source of perdition. Finally, *rûaḥ 'iw'îm* in Isa. 19:14 refers not only to the spirit of confusion that will make the Egyptians "stagger in all their doings," but also to a blindness leading to transgression. The noun recurs in Qumran as an element obstructing the repentance or turn (*šûḇ* hiphil) of the *nepeš* (1QH 6:23) or engulfing sinners because of their rebellion (*peša',* pl., 1QH 7:5).[30] In these two passages the translation "whirlwind" is probably too harmless (cf. also Sir. 37:31).[31]

In Ps. 90:1 the initially seemingly appropriate rendering of the noun *mā'ôn* as "hiding place," and even its expanded understanding as "refuge," do not really fit the psalm's tone of lamentation; hence one might follow S. D. Goitein's derivation from *'wy* and his suggestion that one translate it rather as a "reminder of sin."[32]

The OT sensibility presumably perceived place-names resonating with the root *'wh* as being ominous; thus the destroyed Canaanite city of *hā'āy* (Josh. 7f., etc.) and the Assyrian city Avva (LXX) whose inhabitants were deported to Palestine (2 K. 17:24, etc.). The Masoretic pointing *'awwâ* expresses perhaps an element of disqualification.[33]

III. *'āwōn* in the Historical Books and Psalms.

1. *Older Works.* In older historical traditions *'āwōn* occurs approximately 20 times as a "vernacular term . . . qualified by a dynamistic understanding of reality."[34] In the majority of instances it refers to the transgressions of human beings toward others, transgressions inevitably prompting drastic consequences for the perpetrator. Typical usage seems to include the admission of guilt (1 S. 25:24; 2 S. 14:9; cf. Gen. 4:13; 44:16) and the petition for a remission of guilt (2 S. 19:20[19]; 24:10). Such *'āwōn* arises through crimes such as fratricide (Gen. 4:13; cf. 44:16), disloyalty of an *'eḇeḏ* toward the king (1 S. 20:1; 25:24; 2 S. 3:8; 19:20[19]), and cultic sacrilege (1 S. 3:13f.; unintentional in 14:41 LXX), which also includes the census (2 S. 24:10). Within this semantic paradigm *ḥāṭā'* (1 S. 20:1; 2 S. 24:10) is closely related. The opposite behavior is viewed as *ḥeseḏ* (2 S. 3:8). The term *'āwōn* means more than an abstract value

---

29. For the former see A. Bertholet, *Hesekiel. HAT* I/13 (1936), 76. For the latter, W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1979), 439: "neutral generality."

30. A different view is taken by M. Wallenstein, "Some Aspects of the Vocabulary and Morphology of the Hymns of the Judean Scrolls," *VT* 7 (1957) 212.

31. E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich, [2]1971), 136f.; J. Maier and K. Schuber, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer* (Munich/Basel, 1995), 211, 213. But cf. also G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach. JSHRZ* III/5 (1981), 596A.

32. S. D. Goitein, "'Mā'ōn' — A Reminder of Sin," *JSS* 10 (1965) 52f.

33. *GesB,* 570.

34. Knierim, *Hauptbegriffe,* 193.

judgment, referring rather to an almost thinglike substance. According to one fixed expression, it is "present in" *(yēš bᵉ)* the perpetrator (1 S. 20:8; 14:41 [LXX]; 2 S. 14:32), indeed, even as a self-efficacious, combative power that eventually "finds" the perpetrating subject (2 K. 7:9) or "happens" to him or her (*qārâ,* 1 S. 28:18), not resting until the subject is killed, i.e., executed by others (1 S. 20:8; 2 S. 14:32; 1 K. 17:18) or "consumed" in *'āwōn* (Gen. 19:15). The reference is thus to fateful guilt caused by a person's iniquitous transgressions; neither "guilt" nor "sin" nor "punishment" provides an adequate translation in such cases.[35]

Semantic considerations provide an answer to the old dispute regarding this lexeme's first occurrence in the Bible, in Cain's lament: *gāḏôl ʻᵃwōnî minnᵉśō'* (Gen. 4:13). Earlier exegetical tradition understood *'āwōn* here as "sin" and added Yahweh as the subject of the inf. *nᵉśō',* translating thus as "to forgive" (already Targ.). Beginning with H. Ewald, however, exegetes have become increasingly inclined to understand *'āwōn* here as "punishment" and Cain as the subject of *nś':* "My punishment is greater than I can bear." The Hebrew notion underlying *'āwōn,* however, allows no such distinction between transgression and punishment. The notion of "bearing" is, of course, to be ascribed to Cain, who is thus faced with his own death (v. 14).[36] The expression *nāśā' 'āwōn* exhibits a slight shift here compared with its customary use only insofar as it usually refers to being faced with certain death, whereas this passage understands such "bearing" by the person in question as an enduring burden but not necessarily as a death sentence. The latter enters only when the "bearer" is no longer capable of "bearing" and has thus collapsed under the burden.

In Gen. 15:16 Abram is told that the *'āwōn* of the Amorites is not yet *šālēm.* This sentence is usually understood to mean that the Amorites will be granted more time to commit even greater sins because the sum of their evil deeds does not yet suffice for judgment. From the perspective of the act-consequence schema, however, which the notion of *'āwōn* always presupposes, the accent here is probably on the consequences. That is, the Amorite burden of guilt has not yet matured such that the inevitable, disastrous consequences will be triggered; thus Abram's offspring are to wait.

Given the self-evident experiential nature of the connection between misdeed and disaster, reference to *'āwōn* in many instances exhibits no discernible direct connection with God; of primary interest was the question concerning the how and when. Nonetheless, from the very outset the Hebrew was aware of those particular institutions strengthening and supporting such connections within life. These included the king on earth, who recalls *'āwōn,* takes account of it, and addresses it (2 S. 3:8; 19:20). The same expressions refer to the invisible divine power (Ex. 20:5; Ps. 32:2; Hos. 8:13) that "finds" *'āwōn* (Gen. 44:16) or condemns a family *(šāpaṭ)* "for the *'āwōn*" (1 S. 3:13).[37] On the one hand, a negative divine power hastens the misdeed-misfortune connection to its inevitable conclusion; on the other hand, God is also the only entity capable of turning away

35. *TLOT,* II, 864.

36. Cf. Knierim, *Hauptbegriffe,* 193; C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1984), 309-11; → נשׂא *nāśā'.*

37. Cf. H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 122.

such burden of guilt from a perpetrator, thereby bringing about a positive outcome. God can take away *'āwōn* from a sinner (*'br* hiphil, 2 S. 24:10) or can permit atonement, though such is excluded for an *'āwōn* with regard to "sacrifice or offering" (*beẕeḇaḥ ûḇeminḥâ* [1 S. 3:14] refer to *'āwōn,* not to *kpr,* contra the usual translation;[38] pre-Chronicler texts never recognize atonement through animal sacrifices).

An ancient, possibly pre-Israelite divine self-predication, probably deriving contextually from a cultic theophany celebration, celebrates El as having the power both to take away sin and to punish it:

> I am Yahweh/El . . . abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness *(ḥeseḏ),* keeping steadfast love for the thousandth generation, forgiving *(nōśē')* iniquity and transgression and sin *(peša'),* yet by no means clearing the guilty (*nqh* piel) but visiting *(pōqēḏ)* the iniquity of the parents upon the children.[39]

In Ex. 34:7 and Nu. 14:18, this formula has been inserted into the J context and in an expanded form appended to the prohibition against (foreign gods and) images contained in the ethical Decalog (Ex. 20:5; Dt. 5:9). In the process, the formula has been reversed: the reference to punishment comes first and the statement about the *'ēl raḥûm weḥannûn* is transferred to the *'ēl qannā'.*[40]

2. *Deuteronomistic Passages.* Deuteronomistic redactors incorporated references to *'āwōn* as a trigger for disaster into their own traditions, but apparently without genuinely appropriating the term themselves. Surprisingly, apart from the adopted Decalog, the term *'āwōn* occurs only once in Deuteronomy (19:15). At most one might find the reformulation of a Deuteronomistic (?) redactor in Josh. 22:17 and 20 (Gen. 15:16). No one has yet investigated why the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic circles apparently avoid a term that in their own time became increasingly more common in prophetic and cultic circles.[41]

3. *Chronicles.* The Chronicler is even more reserved in this regard. Chronicles appropriates the term *'āwōn* only once as a citation (1 Ch. 21:8 = 2 S. 24:10). Beyond this it occurs in connection with the two penitential prayers in Ezr. 9:6f.,13 and Neh. 9:2, doubtless deriving from cultic custom, and once in the memoirs of Nehemiah (3:37).

4. *Psalms.* The Psalter, with 31 occurrences, provides information about the cultic use of this lexeme. Approximately half of these occurrences involve laments or thanksgiving psalms of the individual that are concerned with warding off individual suffering caused by *'āwōn.* Hymns rarely mention *'āwōn* except perhaps in praise of a God who in both the past and the present has liberated his people from such burdens of

---

38. E.g., ibid., 121.

39. Cf. J. Scharbert, "Formgeschichte und Exegese von Ex 34,6f und seiner Parallelen," *Bibl* 38 (1957) 130-50.

40. Rost takes a different view.

41. Again, Rost takes a different view.

iniquity (65:4[3]; 78:38; 85:3[2]; 106:43-45). Synonymous parallel terms include the two related terms for sin: *ḥaṭṭā't* (6 times: 32:5; 38:19[18]; 51:4[2]; 59:4f.[3f.]; 85:3[2]; 109:14), with the variations *ḥ^{a}ṭā'â* and *ḥēṭ'* (once each: 51:7[5]; 32:1); and *peša'* (4 occurrences: 32:5; 59:4f.[3f.]; 89:33[32]; 107:17). This does not, of course, establish complete synonymity. Because *ḥaṭṭā't* appears in the plural next to *'āwōn* in the singular (85:3[2]), or in the construct relationship *'āwōn ḥaṭṭā'ṯî* (32:5), *ḥaṭṭā't* refers presumably to the individual deed, the concrete sin whose sum then elicits *'āwōn* as the enduring consequence.

Just which transgressions or crimes actually lead to *'āwōn* is not explicated. Only one passage directly associates *'āwōn* with transgressions against divine ordinances, 89:32f.(31f.), though this involves special guidelines for the king rather than a Mosaic law. The evidence thus does not really permit one to equate preexilic use of *'āwōn* with transgression against the law. Clearly, the cause of *'āwōn* is found not only in false behavior toward God, but also in misdeeds against one's fellows. The *'āwōn* caused by a wicked person surrounds *(sbb)* and injures the innocent (49:6[5]). This passage already makes clear that in cultic use, too, *'āwōn* is understood not as an abstract term but as an existing, albeit invisible, substantive sphere. Furthermore, the subject of *'āwōn* is affected even more severely than is the object of the deed, and the psalms repeatedly provide examples of this "retro-effect." Leading up to the evil deed, the wicked find *(māṣā')* the *'āwōn* and turn it into the driving force of their behavior (36:3[2]). Once they have acted maliciously, however, their *'^{a}wōnôṯ* grow over their heads and oppress them (38:5[4]), proving to be stronger than they (65:4[3]) and thus bringing about their fateful ruin. They are afflicted by their *'āwōn* (107:17), stumble in it *(kšl b^e,* 31:11[10]), or are brought low through it (106:43). Because their *'^{a}wōnôṯ* can be more numerous even than the hairs on their heads, they inevitably destroy the wicked (40:3[2]). The understanding of the act-consequence schema associated with this lexeme undergoes a special expansion in the "penitential psalm," 51. The sphere of perdition associated with *'āwōn* encircled the psalmist even before his birth: "Indeed, I was born guilty, amid the burden of sin *(ḥēṭ')* my mother conceived me" (v. 7[5]).

To escape this fateful condition of sin, the believer stays away from *'āwōn (šāmar min,* 18:24[23]). Once having fallen prey to it, however, the believer confesses these transgressions to God instead of concealing them (32:5; 38:19[18]).

Even though such *'āwōn* is actually an almost thinglike essence on earth, God is indeed aware of it and pursues it by activating the misdeed-misfortune sphere around the perpetrators and hastening their ruin. God sets out human *'āwōn* before himself so as not to overlook it (90:8; 109:14f.). His remembrance *(zāḵar)* of *'āwōn* represents not only a cognitive act but a dynamic one as well (79:8), as does his conscious reckoning *(ḥāšaḇ,* 32:2). God brings to fruition the fate of the wicked commensurate with the *'āwōn* (*gāmal,* 103:10), and where he marks *(šāmar)* a person's *'āwōn* there can be no recovery (130:3). In some instances God adds *(nāṯan)* new *'āwōn* as misfortune upon previous *'āwōn,* i.e., as yet another consequence (69:28[27]). Or he remembers the sins of the fathers and visits them on the descendants (109:14). God's chastising advent *(pāqaḏ)* causes the cloak of misdeeds around the wicked to turn into instant ruin (89:33[32]).

Not in every case, however, is God intent on bringing to bitter fruition the misdeed-misfortune schema prompted by *'āwōn.* His occasional support of the pernicious power of *'āwōn* can derive from his intention to chastise *(ysr)* sinners, i.e., to make them capable of good lives again through temporary suffering (39:12[11]). Above all, however, God is interested in liberating the guilty through atonement. Hence the Psalter underscores his positive help in freeing persons from their burden of sin just as much as it does his negative punishment of *'āwōn.* This is why his sanctuary on Zion is extolled; for "to you all flesh shall come because of *'ᵃwōnôṯ.* Our transgressions *(pᵉšā'îm)* are too much for us. You atone for them" (65:3f.[2f.]; cf. 78:38).

Since atonement takes place in the temple, it refers (as in P; see below) to a ritual act through which the human burden of sin is transferred to an animal functioning as a representative *(ḥaṭṭā'ṯ).* The same probably applies to the parallel statement concerning the "pardoning"[42] of *'āwōn* (25:11; 103:3; 130:3f.), though this does not refer to a purely spiritual "forgiveness" of the sort usually suggested by modern translations. For in such instances, Yahweh himself bears away human *'āwōn* (*nāśā',* 32:5; 85:3[2]), washing *(kibbes)* or wiping *(māḥâ)* it away (51:4,11[2]9]), redeeming all of Israel in this way (*pāḏâ,* 130:8; cf. Lev. 27:27; Ex. 13:13).

This divine activity derives from the "characteristics" and metahistorical entities of activity surrounding God. Such include wrath and fury that awaken wherever *'āwōn* arises in human society (38:4f.[3f.]; 78:37f.; 90:7f.). More frequently, God's positive actions in atoning deliverance of persons or a people burdened by *'āwōn* are traced back to his unique covenantal loyalty (*ḥeseḏ,* 89:33f.[32f.]; 103:3f.,10f.; 106:43f.; 107:17-21; 130:7f.), and occasionally even explicitly to the *bᵉrîṯ* associated with this *ḥeseḏ* (25:10f.; 89:33-35[32-34]; 106:43-45). Strikingly, God's *ṣᵉḏāqâ* is never mentioned in this context, or is so at most in connection with the sphere avoided by anyone entrapped "in" *'āwōn* (69:28[27]).

IV. *'āwōn* in the Prophets.

1. *Preexilic.* Surprisingly, among the preexilic prophets united in the Twelve, all but Hosea avoid the term *'āwōn.* Amos does include a passage (3:2) that many exegetes think contains the quintessence of the proclamation of the historical Amos: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will punish *(pāqaḏ)* you for all your iniquities *('ᵃwōnōṯ).*" This saying does indeed delineate, in contrast to Israel's preexilic self-understanding, the paradoxical manner in which God chastises *'āwōn* even more severely with regard to his chosen people. This language, however, is not typical of Amos himself; because it corresponds more to the pentateuchal vocabulary of J, it is thus probably part of the redactional composition of the book of Amos.[43] Consensus ascribes Mic. 7:18f. (God is *nōśē' 'āwōn)* to the later conclusion to Micah.

Otherwise this lexeme occurs only in Hosea, and although it occurs frequently and

42. → סלח *sālaḥ.*

43. K. Koch, *Amos,* part 2, *Synthese. AOAT* 30/2 (1976), 15; cf. part 1, *Programm und Analyse,* 126.

emphatically there, the context is not always transparent. It becomes clear that *'āwōn* is entirely a collective matter affecting the people as a whole. Here *'āwōn* arises from illegitimate kingship (13:2) and from the degenerate cult in which his contemporaries zealously engage (8:13; 9:8f.; 10:10 conj.). In this context 4:8 criticizes priests who "feed on the *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* of my people and are greedy for their *'āwōn.*"

Exegetes have long disputed whether *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* here refers technically to a sin "offering" (actually better suited for an atonement ritual using an animal)[44] as in P (Lev. 4) and whether *'āwōn* has then been used ad hoc in analogy to this. This explains more easily the priests' contradictory wish that the people might sin as much as possible.[45] Alternatively, both *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* and *'āwōn* are possibly being used in a nontechnical sense, distorting then in a sarcastic fashion the purpose of the normal cult — which among other things provides for the priests' own income — into its opposite.[46] P, however, uses *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* in referring back to earlier cultic rituals; this writing thus still views the *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* of a guilty person as being transferred *realiter,* as a kind of sin-substance, to the animal, which thenceforth bears that *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ.*[47] Hence Hosea may well also have used the lexeme *'āwōn* to refer to this act of transference.

For Hosea, too, the sg. *'āwōn* refers to the result or consequence of individual acts of sin (pl. *ḥaṭṭā'ōṯ* in 8:13; 9:9). It is "bound up" (*ṣrr,* 13:12) as a burden on the sinful people, who thus remain "bound" to this fate (*'āsar,* 10:10 conj.) until they stumble "in it" (*kšl,* 5:5; 14:2). These parallels can perhaps also explain the oft-conjectured statement in 12:9(8). On this view Ephraim boasts of having found (ethically grounded and thus enduring?) wealth *('ôn)* compared with the notorious deceptions of Canaan (v. 8[7]): "in all of my gain no *'āwōn* has been found [*ymṣ'w,* pointing as niphal?] in me that would be sin *(ḥēṭ')*."[48] The conceptual presupposition here is apparently that an *'āwōn* not only burdens he perpetrators themselves but also becomes an invisibly burdensome part of their actual works (*y^e gîa'* here means not laborious toil but its products).[49]

Hosea believes that Yahweh encounters his sinful people almost like an impersonal dynamic that hastens to its conclusion the nascent perdition residing within them: "When I would heal Israel, the *'āwōn* of Ephraim is revealed [contrary to all divine intention!]" (7:1; cf. 5:5). God's theophanic chastisement *(pqd)* calls forth "foolish" prophecy (9:7) and forces Israel back to Egypt (8:13). At the end of this catastrophic period, however, he will make himself available to bear away *(nś')* the (remnant of) *'āwōn* himself, thus making repentance possible (14:2f.[1f.]).

Proto-Isaiah refers 5 times to *'āwōn.* On the one hand, the people irrationally drag

---

44. → חָטָא *ḥāṭā' (chāṭā'),* IV, 316ff.

45. A. Weiser, *Das Buch der zwölf Kleinen Propheten. I. Die Propheten Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadja, Jona, Micha. ATD* 24 (⁷1979), in loc.

46. So in loc. F. Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton. KHC* 13 (1904); T. H. Robinson, *Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten. HAT* I/14 (²1954); similarly W. Rudolph, *Hosea. KAT* XIII/1 (1966); H. W. Wolff, *Hosea. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1974), 81, is undecided.

47. → חָטָא *ḥāṭā' (chāṭā'),* IV, 316ff.

48. Ibid.

49. Cf. *HAL,* II, 385f.

this power of perdition along with it with "cords of falsehood" (5:18), and they are thus laden with it (1:4; cf. 30:13); ultimately, the harvest will be death (22:14). On the other hand, Isaiah also mentions the possibility of eliminating this *'āwōn* through cultic atonement. Indeed, the prophet has experienced this himself (6:7), but still excludes its efficacy for the present community (22:14).

2. *Exilic.* This lexeme acquires greater significance among the exilic prophets. The book of Jeremiah is convinced that the degenerate and foolish cult of its contemporaries has brought forth *'āwōn* (2:22; 16:10,18). To a large extent it has also been left behind as a historic inheritance of past generations (14:20; 32:18). Such *'āwōn* clings like permanent filth to its perpetrators (13:22), and has even affected natural laws around them (5:25) and enticed rapacious external powers on the perpetrators as a response[50] (13:22). Whoever reaps *'āwōn* will one day die in it (31:30; 51:6).

Wherever reference is made to Yahweh's power in connection with *'āwōn,* he appears as the one who *šillēm 'āwōn* (16:18; 32:18). Although this verb is usually translated as "repay," it actually refers to "completing" a fateful sphere of action. This fateful course of events attaching to such sin and guilt is set into motion by God's chastising advent (*pqd,* 25:12; 36:31). For the sake of the covenant, however, God can also take the opposite course of action and wipe away such *'āwōn* taint from the guilty through (cultic) atonement (*kipper, sālaḥ,* 18:23; 33:8; 36:3; 50:20). Later, appended passages promise that at the commencement of the period of salvation, Yahweh's covenantal loyalty will remove once and for all the *'āwōn* that has accrued through history (31:30,34; 30:8; 36:3; 50:20).

Almost one-fifth of all occurrences of this term are in the book of Ezekiel. For this prophet, who himself comes from a priestly family, *'āwōn* constitutes "the great problem upon which life turns."[51] The two terms *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* and *peša'* occur once as synonyms, yet do so such that at the same time *'āwōn* in the singular emerges as the comprehensive result of the other two plural expressions (21:29[24]). In 36:31 "abominable deeds" *(tô'ēḇôṯ)* parallels *'āwōn,* and in 18:20 its antonym is *ṣᵉḏāqâ.*

Although *'āwōn* can be used without an alternating member even in *parallelismus membrorum,* still the "wicked" *(rāšā')* frequently appears as the instigating subject of *'āwōn* (3:18f., etc.). A survey of these texts reveals that precisely in the book of Ezekiel, God almost never appears as the subject of action involved with *'āwōn.* The only clear statement is found in the prediction in 36:33 that Yahweh will rescue Israel and cleanse *(ṭhr)* it of the iniquities of its past. At most the day of divine wrath in 7:19 and the concealment of the divine countenance in 39:23 might be associated indirectly with the elimination of *'āwōn* predicted in the larger context. The peculiar assertion in 21:29(24) that the wicked will "bring" their own guilt "to remembrance" (*zkr* hiphil) is probably to be understood as a reflexive expression (so most commentators).[52] In any

50. → ענה *'ānâ.*
51. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 306.
52. A different view is taken by Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 438, who prefers an impersonal translation: "because men denounce you in your guilt."

event, the expression "before God" is to be added to the passage. These, however, are all the passages that mention God.

In the remaining references to *ʿāwōn,* although God is always the one who draws attention to past sin and announces its chastisement or elimination, he does so not in the fashion of divine intervention, but rather as the effect of the act-consequence schema the perpetrators themselves have set into motion. A fatal *ʿāwōn* nexus emerges from idolatry (14:3f.; 44:10), false prophecy (14:10), disregard for the poor (16:49), dishonesty (28:18), and other misdeeds that fill the land with blood (9:9) or profane the central sanctuary (28:18). The book repeatedly emphasizes that those responsible for the *ʿāwōn* must from now on bear the punishment elicited by such deeds (*nāśāʾ,* 14:10; 44:10,12). The guilty waste away (*mqq,* niphal) under their *ʿāwōn,* i.e., they receive neither bread nor water, and ultimately perish (4:17; 24:23). In short the wicked will die in this sphere of sin and guilt *(baʿᵃwōnô yāmûṯ)* and lose the capacity for life itself (*ḥāyâ,* 3:18f.; 18:17f.; 33:8f.; cf. 7:13). Ezekiel does, however, acknowledge the important limitation (for the time after the commencement of the interim period?) that such a burden will not be inherited across the generations (18:19f.; referring to individual delimitation of the act-consequence schema).[53]

To underscore this connection between sin and ruin, Ezekiel coins the peculiar expression *mikšôl ʿāwōn,* "the object of stumbling of iniquity [NRSV 'stumbling block of their iniquity']." Such includes greed for silver and gold (7:19) and the idols placed as *mikšôl* before the people by the adherents to such cults (14:3f.; cf. 44:12). Two different explanations for *mikšôl ʿāwōn* are possible here given the ambiguity inhering in *ʿāwōn* between sin or guilt on the one hand, and punishment or ruin on the other. First, it may be understood as the "opportunity for sin" and as the "entrance points of temptation."[54] This, however, is problematical because *ʿāwōn* hardly ever refers to the current sin itself, but rather to its consequences for the perpetrator such that an act of resistance *(pešaʿ)* then becomes a *mikšôl ʿāwōn;* i.e., the reference cannot really be to a *mikšôl* of the *pešaʿ* or of the *ḥaṭṭāʾṯ.* The preferable interpretation is thus that this expression refers to the fateful turn for the worst attaching to the sphere of guilt in the first place, i.e., to the "stumbling block" to ruin already concealed in this *ʿāwōn* from the outset.

Another expression in Ezekiel (3 occurrences) is *ʿēṯ ʿᵃwōn qēṣ,* "time of guilt of the end." This cannot refer to some apocalyptic end stage, since contextually this *ʿāwōn* time had already commenced for contemporary Israel with the catastrophe of 587/586 (35:5) and since the corresponding time commences for the normal sinner with "his day" (21:30,34[25,29]), the day on which the sword is put to his neck. The reference is thus to "the time of the guilt-end," i.e., to the date at which the sphere of perdition and guilt comes to fruition over the perpetrator in a final, fateful end.

Although Ezekiel emphasizes the individual and each individual's fate as does no other prophet, he does also point out that, through history, *ʿāwōn* has been an ongoing, collective, even evil power transcending time. This becomes particularly clear in the

---

53. K. Koch, *The Prophets,* 2 vols. (Eng. trans., Philadelphia, 1983-84), II, 105-8.
54. So *HAL,* II, 582, following Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 306.

symbolic actions in 4:4-6, where Ezekiel is lying on the ground immobile on his side. The interpretation is that Yahweh lays on him *(nāṯan)* or the prophet brings on himself *(śîm)* the 390 years of the northern kingdom's *ʿāwōn* and the southern kingdom's corresponding 40 years; during the fixed period of time Ezekiel thus "bears" *(nāśāʾ)* the sin and guilt of both parts of the people.

He gathers together in his symbolic connection Israel's guilt as a burden on his own life.[55] Of course, this frequent reference to "bearing" the sphere of guilt, *nāśāʾ ʿāwōn,* here refers not to any efficacious transference or representative suffering, since it was precisely because of this *ʿāwōn* that Israel was deported (39:13). First Egypt, then Nebuchadnezzar functioned as the powers who in Yahweh's commission brought Israelite guilt to remembrance *(mazkîr ʿāwōn),* thereby activating within history, through their military actions, the power of perdition inhering in *ʿāwōn* and bringing it to its logical conclusion.

Deutero-Isaiah mentions the people's fateful guilt in this sense in four passages. Indeed, his writing opens with the jubilant cry that Jerusalem's *ʿāwōn* has been paid *(rāṣâ* II; cf. Lev. 26) or was graciously accepted by God as a kind of blood ritual (Isa. 40:2).[56] This was preceded, however, by a long period in which *ʿāwōn* wrought its disastrous havoc, doing so even though Yahweh had tried through the institution of atonement (transference rituals) at the Jerusalem temple to eliminate the sheer quantity of sin among the people as well as its consequences (43:24). Indeed, it was not God but the Israelites themselves who sold themselves (*mkr* niphal) to foreign domination and economic disaster through their own *ʿāwōn* (50:1). Yahweh's mysterious servant will participate in a special way in the imminent commencement of salvation. He was wounded for the iniquities of the community, iniquities whose pernicious weight God allowed to crush him, the innocent one (53:5f.); by bearing *(nāśāʾ)* this *ʿāwōn* (here, in contrast to Ezk. 4, clearly as exoneration), he will make "the many" *ṣaddîq* (53:11).

Trito-Isaiah applies these Deutero-Isaianic ideas to his own contemporaries. Divine wrath awakens wherever there is *ʿāwōn* (57:17; 65:7). Nevertheless, Yahweh does stand ready above all to render exonerating aid even though this is not always possible, "for your iniquities have been barriers (*bdl* hiphil) between you and your God" (59:2). Hence people will still have to recognize *(yāḏaʿ)* their *ʿᵃwōnôṯ* (59:12); elsewhere, the Hebrew term for such "knowing" refers to "experiencing something on one's own person" (cf. 53:3 in reference to illness).

The central focus of Zechariah's (appended?) vision of the high priest Joshua's change of clothes is the divine extirpation of guilt: "See, I have taken (*ʿbr* hiphil) your *ʿāwōn* away from you" (3:4). It is unclear whether this refers to the high priest's personal transgressions or to the *ʿāwōn* of those who have returned from exile and become tainted in the unclean country, or to Israel's collective guilt, the guilt that precipitated the exile in the first place.[57] To this act on the person of Joshua, 3:9 now adds one for

---

55. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 1,* 164f.
56. H. J. Stoebe, "Überlegungen zu Jesaja 40,1-11," *TZ* 40 (1984) 104-13.
57. Cf. C. Jeremias, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. FRLANT* 117 (1977), 208.

Joshua himself, who on a kind of eschatological day of reconciliation and at the divine behest removes the *'āwōn* "of this land" by means of a mysterious stone with seven facets.[58]

V. *'āwōn* in the Priestly Document. The Priestly document (including the Holiness Code) generally uses *'āwōn* in connection with the verb *nāśā'*, "bear" (18 of 27 occurrences). Commensurately, the reference is to a burden that weighs on the perpetrators and ultimately oppresses and brings them down. Although such perdition unavoidably accompanies grievous sins, it does not necessarily affect the perpetrators themselves; for in the language of P, the subject of *nāśā' 'āwōn* changes.[59] Generally speaking, the expression actually refers to persons who have transgressed the law (12 times); more specifically, it refers to their vital power (*nepeš,* Lev. 5:1,17; 7:18; 17:16; Nu. 15:31). Part of the task of priests and Levites, however, is to remove *'āwōn* from Israel or from the sanctuary itself, to "bear" that *'āwōn* representatively, and by virtue of their own inherent quality to render it harmless (Ex. 28:38; Lev. 10:17; Nu. 18:1,23). Furthermore, the high priest is also able through confession and leaning a hand on the animal's head to transfer the *'āwōn* to that animal such that the "scapegoat" is now the one bearing it (Lev. 16:21f.). In the larger sense, in the case of particularly grievous transgressions the *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* animal or the *'āšām* animal is the means by which the fateful *'āwōn* nexus is removed from people and atoned through the death of the animal itself, which is sent to its death in their stead (5:1-6,17-19). Wherever → כפר *kpr* is correctly enacted, this burden of *'āwōn* is removed forever (10:17).

An *'āwōn* arises when someone transgresses with regard to the sacred things or to the ritual (Ex. 28:38; Lev. 7:18; 19:8) or becomes defiled in some way (*ṭāmē'*, Lev. 5:2; 17:16; 18:25; 26:43). To some extent, this also includes unintentional defilement and certain unintentional transgressions against the divine ordinances (5:2,17), though Lev. 4 does not classify unintentional sins (*šᵉgāḡâ*) under *'āwōn.* This seems thus to presuppose some degree of responsibility on the part of the perpetrator, though *'āwōn* can also be inherited from one's ancestors (26:39f.) or through the community of the people at large (16:21f.). Such guilt is conceived as a substantive entity and now accompanies and pursues the (circle of) perpetrators.

In P as elsewhere, *'āwōn* does not refer to the actual act of transgression itself. This is presupposed as disloyalty (*ma'al*) or as sins (*ḥaṭṭō'ṯ*) (Lev. 26:40; 16:21). Lev. 5:17 also suggests a kind of logical sequence: "sin (*ḥāṭā'*) — incur guilt (*'āšēm*) — bear *'āwōn*," whereas a different passage seems to use *'āšēm* as the overriding term to *'āwōn* (5:1; cf. with v. 5; 22:16).

Whoever bears *'āwōn* is already destined to perish. Such persons will "languish" and "die" in this sphere of guilt (Ex. 28:43; Lev. 26:39). Only the person who is free of *'āwōn* (*nqh*) can live unencumbered (Nu. 5:31). Because *'āwōn* also perniciously affects the surroundings, the cultic community is obligated in the interest of its own self-

---

58. Cf. W. Rudolph, *Haggai, Sacharja 1–8, 9–14, Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 100-103.
59. → נשא *nāśā'*.

preservation to "cut off from their midst" every guilt-laden *nepeš* (*krt* niphal, Lev. 19:8; 20:17; Nu. 15:31).[60] Thus the notion of a pernicious, fateful sphere also underlies P's use of *'āwōn.* Accordingly, P also refers occasionally to the divine activation of this condition that then drives the perpetrators to their deserved end. In the case of suspected adultery, the jealousy offering granted by Yahweh possibly brings to remembrance *(zkr)* an *'āwōn,* activating thereby the imprecatory power of the drink consecrated by the priest (Nu. 5:15). Similarly, it is also Yahweh who punishes *(pqd)* the land defiled by the nations with such *'āwōn;* the result is that the land itself vomits out its inhabitants (Lev. 18:25). It is worth noting here that God does not directly punish the perpetrators themselves, but rather the sphere of guilt that has spread out across the land they previously inhabited.

The thwarting of *'āwōn* is mentioned much more frequently as a divine action than is its punishment, something already supported by the cultic ordinances established at Sinai, whose essential tasks include liberating the community from such guilt through atonement rituals.[61] The sanctity of the priestly vestments already not only protects the priest himself from the effects of *'āwōn* during altar service (Ex. 28:43), but also is able to remove the *'āwōn* of the Israelites' own transgressions and make the community acceptable (v. 38; cf. Nu. 18:1,31). The atonement ritual itself *(ḥaṭṭā'ṯ)* is entrusted to the priest that he might bear the congregation's *'āwōn* in its stead and thereby "to make atonement on their behalf before Yahweh" (Lev. 10:17; cf. 5:1-6). God's actions on behalf of removing this guilt are emphasized especially in the high priest's commission for the great Day of Atonement; on that day he is to summarize in his confession of sin the people's sins and transfer them to the "scapegoat," which then bears them off into the wilderness (16:21f.). Use of the term *'āwōn* is one example among many demonstrating that the legislative concerns of the Priestly document focus on institutionalizing God's own activity in removing guilt rather than fostering some sort of nomism.

Lev. 26:40-45 speaks of those members of the people who finally humble their uncircumcised hearts and their *'āwōn yirṣû,* the result being that Yahweh again remembers his covenant. In this case (as in Isa. 40:2), exegetes generally assume the presence of a special root *rāṣâ* II, "pay off, discharge," whereas G. Gerleman proposes *rṣh* I: they have accepted their guilt/punishment.[62]

VI. Qumran. Reference to human *'āwōn* occupies an important place in the Qumran writings. As before, *'āwōn* refers to the result of *ḥaṭṭā'ṯ* and *peša'* (1QS 11:9), but is subordinated to the apparently more comprehensive term for guilt, *'ašmâ* (1QS 5:15; 1QH 8:12; cf. 1QS 1:23; 11QT 26:11f.). The anthropologically understood notion of sinfulness that elicits an inclination to *'āwōn* in the human heart has generated a

60. → VII, 348.

61. K. Koch, "Sühne und Sündenvergebung um die Wende von der exilischen zur nachexilischen Zeit," *EvT* 26 (1966) 217-39; B. Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. WMANT* 55 (1982).

62. Gerleman, *TLOT,* III, 1260. Cf. *GesB,* 772; *HAL,* III, 1281f.; K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 362.

special substantive, *naʿᵃwîâ* (1QS 5:24; 10:11; 11:9; 1QH 17:19). One sees occasionally the kinds of transgressions that actually evoke *ʿāwōn,* such as illegal accumulation of wealth or persecution of the Teacher of Righteousness (1QpHab 8:12; 9:9). Yet even a neglected chance to rebuke or admonish a fellow member of the community can result in *ʿāwōn* (1QS 6:1). The earlier understanding of the misdeed-disaster schema is maintained as well, e.g., in reference to the inevitable stumbling (*kšl* or the noun *mikšôl*) of the wicked in their *ʿāwōn* (1QS 2:12,17; 11:12; 1QH 4:15). As already among the prophets, so also here the consequences of the people's own *ʿāwōn* include decimation by external enemies (1QpHab 4:8).

The Qumran writings, however, emphasize even more strongly than do the Psalms or prophets the fateful historical inheritance of guilt. All human beings are ruled by the service *(ʿᵃbōdâ)* of *ʿāwōn* (1QH 1:27); the petitioner knows that he has been in *ʿāwōn* even from his mother's womb (1QH 4:29). The metahistorical origin of such guilt is ultimately found in the angel of darkness or in Belial himself (1QS 3:22; 1:23).

More clearly than in any OT writing, the Qumran writings emphasize and extol God's aid in turning away the sphere of *ʿāwōn* from the guilty individual or people. God wants to atone *ʿāwōn (kpr),* cleanse it *(ṭhr),* cast it away (*šlk* hiphil), or bear it away (*nśʾ,* 1QS 2:8; 3:7f.; 1QH 1:32; CD 3:18) as already announced by Moses (1QH 17:12,17). This behavior is grounded in his covenant and loyalty (*ḥsd, ṣdqh,* CD 4:10; 1QH 4:37; 1QS 11:14).

1QS 8:3 suggests that, apart from the priest, who acts cultically at God's behest, other members of the community might also be capable of warding off their own or someone else's *ʿāwōn* and of thus avoiding ruin. On this view, the council of the community "shall preserve the faith in the land *wlrṣt ʿwwn bʿwśy mšpṭ.*" The usual translation is "atone for sin by the practice of justice."[63] The particle before *ʿôśê* is thus construed as *bᵉ essentiae,* though the fixed expression *rāṣâ bᵉ* otherwise means "be pleased with someone."[64] Is this perhaps the root *rāṣâ* II (as in Lev. 26:41,43; Isa. 40:2): "to take away *ʿāwōn* among those who (now) practice *mišpāṭ*"?[65]

VII. Biblical Aramaic. Although *ʿᵃwāyâ* occurs but once in Biblical Aramaic, it does so in a passage that has been discussed for centuries (Dnl. 4:24[27]). The Israelite sage gives the following advice to Nebuchadnezzar, who is threatened with hybris and ruin: "tear yourself away *(prq)* from your sphere of sin [Q *ḥṭyk,* equivalent to Heb. *ḥēṭʾ*?][66] through loyalty [toward your subjects] and from your iniquities *(ʿwytk)* through mercy to the oppressed." The expression *prq* is to be understood analogous to "breaking a yoke away from" as in Gen. 27:40. A separation from the accustomed royal arrogance requires a decision for fundamental reorientation and future modesty. This will

63. Lohse, *Texte aus Qumran,* 28f.; Maier and Schuber, *Qumran-Essener,* 158.
64. *HAL,* III, 1281.
65. For other suggestions, cf. J. Strugnell, "Notes on 1QS 1,17-18; 8,3-4 and 1QM 17,8-9," *CBQ* 29 (1967) 580-82.
66. J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Comm. on the Book of Daniel. ICC* (1950), in loc.

interrupt or put a stop to the fateful nexus of guilt. One probably cannot, however, go so far as to ascribe to the statement a complete compensation according to which the previously accumulated *ʿawāyâ* would be "atoned" if good works were performed from now on (so many comms. following LXX, Vulg.).

VIII. LXX. The LXX translates *ʿāwōn* largely with *adikía* (79 times), *hamartía* (68 times + 10 times in Sirach) or *anomía* (64 times), and in isolated instances with *ágnoia* (Dnl. 9:16), *aitía* (Gen. 4:13), *kakía* (3 times), *asébeia* (Ezk. 33:9), and *paranomía* (Prov. 5:22)

Koch

עוּף *ʿûp*; עוֹף *ʿôp*

Contents: I. Etymology. II. General Usage: 1. Verb; 2. Substantive; 3. LXX. III. Theological Meaning: 1. Verb; 2. Substantive. IV. Qumran.

I. Etymology. The root *ʿwp* occurs especially in the West Semitic linguistic sphere as Ugar. *ʿp*, though also in a 7th-century-B.C. Canaanite invocation text as *ʿptʾ* (ptcp. "flying one"), the name of a female deity probably conceived as a demoness.[1] In Arabic the root *ʿwf (ʿāfa)* refers to (a bird's) "hovering over something," and is attested in Old South Arabic personal names and as Egyp. *ʿpy.*[2]

In the Hebrew OT *ʿwp* occurs 26 times as a verb and 71 as a substantive, then twice in the Aramaic texts as a substantive (Dnl. 2:38; 7:6). The basic meaning of the root is "fly" in reference to the typical means of locomotion of winged creatures; hence the

---

ʿûp. J. Feliks, *The Animal World of the Bible* (Tel Aviv, 1962); F. D. Hubmann, *Untersuchungen zu den Konfessionen Jer 11,18–12,6 und Jer 15,10-20. FzB* 30 (1978); P. Hugger, *Jahwe meine Zuflucht. MüSt* 13 (1971), esp. 198; C. Jeremias, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. FRLANT* 117 (1977); J. Jeremias, *Theophanie: Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlicher Gattung. WMANT* 10 (²1977); K. R. Joines, *Serpent Symbolism in the OT* (Haddonfield, N.J., 1974); O. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen und Siegelkunst. SBS* 84/85 (1977); idem and U. Winter, *Vögel als Boten: Studien zu Ps 68,12-14, Gen 8,6-12, Koh 10,20 und dem Aussenden von Botenvögeln in Ägypten. OBO* 14 (1977); M. A. Murray, "The Serpent Hieroglyph," *JEA* 34 (1948) 117f.; A. Ohler, "Die Offenbarung des verborgenen Gottes: Die Berufungsvision des Ezechiel II," *BiLe* 11 (1970) 159-68; W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973); H. Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches. BZAW* 132 (1973); D. J. Wiseman, "Flying Serpents?" *TynB* 23 (1972) 108-10.

1. For the former see *UT*, no. 1833; *WUS*, no. 2068; M. Dahood, *RSP*, I, 162, no. 146; 230, no. 292. For the latter, *KAI*, 27:1, 19.

2. Cf. *GesB;* W. S. Müller, *Die Wurzel mediae und tertiae y/w im Altsüdarabischen* (diss., Tübingen, 1962), 83; *WbÄS*, I, 179.

basic meaning of the root as a substantive is "flying creatures, winged creatures," functioning thus as a comprehensive term encompassing birds and insects.[3]

II. General Usage.

1. *Verb.* In the qal *'wp* occurs 18 times; in Dt. 4:17; Isa. 31:5; Nah. 3:16; and Prov. 26:2, this stem refers to the form of forward motion through the air typical of winged creatures, focusing, however, on typical features of such movement. Isa. 31:5 focuses on the protective, guarding function facilitated by hovering above something (cf. Dt. 32:11). Prov. 26:2 addresses the apparent aimlessness of birds flying to and fro, something also characterizing the unwarranted curse.[4] Most passages use *'wp* metaphorically in the qal while simultaneously focusing on the typical features of a bird's flight. The term describes such movement through the air with Yahweh (Ps. 18:11[Eng. v. 10]; conj. 2 S. 22:11) or an arrow (*ḥēṣ,* Ps. 91:5) as the subject. In Job 5:7 *'wp* is to be understood as movement up into the air in connection with the subj. *b^enê-rešep* ("sparks"); following G. Fohrer, *rešep* is to be translated here in its basic meaning of "spark, flame, lightning," since a mythological background involving the deity *rešep* is incomprehensible in this passage.[5] Here the ascending motion through the air is emphasized as the natural movement for sparks. Isa. 11:14 and Hab. 1:8 focus on the motion of a predatory bird hunting its prey in flight; here the verb describes the predatory campaigns of Ephraim and Judah during the period of salvation (or those of the Chaldeans), and emphasizes the surprising, surging element against which one's prey is defenseless. Isa. 60:8 focuses on the floating, joyous quality of flight; here the flight of homecoming doves probably alludes to the Israelites' return from the Diaspora. Ps. 90:10 evokes the fleeting element evoked when the transitoriness of human life is considered, and Job 20:8 emphasizes that the wicked "will fly away like a dream, without leaving even a trace in external reality."[6] The petitioner in Ps. 55:7f.(6f.) refers to flying as the quickest way to get far away, wishing for the wings of a dove that might take him far away to a secure place. In Prov. 23:5b *(Q),* a puzzling passage,[7] *'wp* refers to something flying up into an inaccessible height, the subject being "wealth." The *Instruction of Amenemope* provides an explanation in its assertion that "they [riches] have made themselves wings like geese and are flown away to the heavens."[8]

Zec. 5:1f. uses the qal participle of *'wp* in describing the scroll of the sixth vision. This "flying scroll" "expresses metaphorically that the curse . . . will be able to reach independently anyone anywhere and with no problem."[9] The scroll's ability to fly may

---

3. K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* I/4 (1966), 144. See *HAL,* II, 801; C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1984), 137.

4. Cf. O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos (Proverbia). BK* XVII (1984), 309.

5. *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 132, 148f.

6. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 329.

7. Cf. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos,* 271.

8. Ch. 7, 10:4f. See *ANET,* 422; *NERT,* 55.

9. C. Jeremias, 192; cf. W. Rudolph, *Haggai, Sacharja 1–8, 9–14, Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), 117.

have something to do with the winged creature in 5:9 that will carry away the wickedness from the land. Zec. 5:1-4 (secondary) describes the curse's eradication of the remaining wicked people in the land with the same flying movements used with regard to the eradication of wickedness itself.

Prov. 23:5a *(Q)* is the only occurrence of *'wp* hiphil; here it describes the movement of a person's eyes toward wealth and riches as a movement into an inaccessible sphere. The expression *mu'āp* in Dnl. 9:21 is extremely difficult to interpret. G. F. Hasel believes that the form represents a hophal participle of the root *y'p* II, a secondary form of the root *'wp* I; the expression in Dnl. 9:21 would accordingly be translated following LXX, Theodotion, Vulg., and Syr. as "swift flight."[10]

In Isa. 14:29; 30:6, the polel participle of *'wp* is attributive to → שׂרף *śārāp*. J. Feliks identifies the flying seraph as the extraordinarily poisonous cobra, while M. A. Murray elucidates this more closely with reference to the *naja nigricolis* that spits poison (= fire). According to Feliks, the cobra swings easily from tree to tree, possibly evoking thereby the notion of flying. By contrast, K. Joines thinks the flying cobra derives from Egyptian illustrations of winged serpents.[11] Whatever the case, this mythological notion of flying underscores the unpredictable and omnipresent power of these creatures.[12] O. Keel emphasizes correctly that these winged creatures do not necessarily represent demonic beings.[13] In illustrations and representations from the ancient Orient, "the eerie wilderness areas were populated with creatures we would describe as mythological or demonic beings." Given the significance of winged seraphim in connection with seals from the 8th century in Judah, and given the presence of a (winged) serpent in Nu. 21:6,8; Dt. 8:15; Isa. 14:29; 30:6, one can probably assume that this is the intended notion in Isa. 6:2 as well.

In Gen. 1:20 *'wp* polel refers to the form "that will from now on characterize flying creatures; such creatures are visualized here flying in the space between the earth and heaven."[14] In Ezk. 32:10 *'wp* polel infinitive describes how Yahweh's "brandishing" of the sword of judgment fills the peoples and kings with terror. Hos. 9:11 uses *'wp* hithpolel to describe the scattering of a flock of birds.

2. *Substantive.* The subst. *'ôp* functions first of all as a comprehensive term for all winged creatures, birds and insects (cf. Gen. 1:20; 6:20; 7:8,14; 8:17,19; 9:10; Lev. 11:13; Dt. 14:20; 1 K. 5:13[4:33]).[15] In Gen. 1:21 the expression *'ôp kānāp* views flying creatures from the perspective of that which makes possible the typical form of existence of flying animals in the first place, namely, as creatures with wings. The term *'ôp* functions as a comprehensive expression in connection with the purity regulations

---

10. → יעף *y'p,* VI, 149. Cf. O. Plöger, *Das Buch Daniel. KAT* XVIII (1965), 133f.; J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Comm. on the Book of Daniel. ICC* (1950), 372.

11. Feliks, 107; Murray, 117f.; Joines, 8.

12. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 13–27* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1997), 96f.

13. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen,* 73 n. 106.

14. O. H. Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift. FRLANT* 115 ([2]1981), 61.

15. Elliger, *Leviticus,* 144; Steck, *Schöpfungsbericht,* 61 n. 217.

(Lev. 11:13,46; 20:25; Dt. 14:20; Ezk. 44:31) as well as in the prohibitions against eating blood (Lev. 7:26; 17:13) and in the prescriptions regarding sacrifices (Gen. 8:20; Lev. 1:14). The combination with *šereṣ* narrows the more comprehensive term down to "small (winged) insects, vermin" (Lev. 11:20f.,23; Dt. 14:19; 11QT 48:3ff.). One particularly striking semantic combination is *'ôp-haššāmayim* (38 occurrences). The expression occurs alone only in Ps. 104:12; Eccl. 10:20; Jer. 4:25; Dnl. 2:38; Hos. 7:12; it normally occurs together with the expression "the creatures of the field (of the earth)" or "the living creatures of the earth and the fish of the sea." Accordingly, the expression derives from those contexts that refer meristically to the totality of animals by adducing the three spheres of life: air, earth, and sea. This is the case in the commission of dominion (Gen. 1:26,28; 9:2) and in reference to the covenant God makes with all living creatures or with all animals on Israel's behalf (Gen. 9:10; Hos. 2:20[18]). These three spheres of life are also mentioned in connection with Israel's sin and God's judgment (Ezk. 38:20; Hos. 4:3; Zeph. 1:3). Gen. 2:19 mentions only the birds of the air and the animals of the field as creations of Yahweh because it is describing creation as such from the perspective of people for whom the sea had no real vital significance. Gen. 1:30; 6:7; 7:23 omit the creatures of the sea because of their fundamentally different manner of life.

One fixed discursive topos occurs in connection with the terminology of judgment in the book of Jeremiah. Corpses are *l^ema'^akāl l^e(kol)-'ôp haššāmayim ûl^ebeh^emat hā'āreṣ* (Dt. 28:26; Jer. 7:33; 16:4; 19:7; 34:20). W. Thiel believes that this represents a Deuteronomistic topos and that the passages in Jeremiah are dependent on Dt. 28:26.[16] But one should carefully consider H. Weippert's suggestion that this represents an expression typical of the book of Jeremiah that was then inserted secondarily into Dt. 28:26.[17] In Jeremiah it appears as a continuation of the three plagues — *ḥereb, rā'āb, deber* — to indicate the utter eradication of those affected by the plagues.[18]

The *parallelismus membrorum* forces Ps. 79:2 to introduce the par. *bāśār* to *n^ebēlâ;* similarly, *beh^emat hā'āreṣ* is replaced by *ḥaytô-'āreṣ* such that the result actually represents a poetic treatment of the topos.[19] The pre-Jeremianic passages are not stylistically consistent. 1 S. 17:44 uses *bāśār* for the "corpse" and *beh^emat haśśādeh* for the animals; 1 S. 17:46 uses *peger* for "corpse" and *ḥayyat hā'āreṣ* for the animals. Nothing comparable can be found for *l^ema'^akāl.*

1 K. 14:11 differentiates between those members of Jeroboam's family who die in the city and those who die in the open country. The former will be eaten by dogs, the latter by birds. According to M. Noth, the Deuteronomistic redactor adopted the expression in 1 K. 14:11 and inserted it into 16:4 and 21:24, which according to Weippert shows that he did not have his own formula for this motif.[20] Rather, it was only a later redactor who recognized in Dt. 28:20-25a the allusion to the triadic expression from

16. P. 130.
17. H. Weippert, *Die Prosareden des Jeremiabuches. BZAW* 132 (1973), 183ff.
18. → דֶּבֶר *deber (debher),* III, 126.
19. Cf. Thiel, 130 n. 73.
20. M. Noth, *Könige 1–16. BK* IX/1 (²1983), 311; Weippert, 186.

Jeremiah and then augmented vv. 25b-26 according to the Jeremianic model.[21] Ezekiel then alters the expression in the prophecies of judgment against Egypt and the pharaoh (Ezk. 29:5; 32:4) and against Gog (39:4) (*n*ᵉ*ḇēlâ* is omitted). In 32:4 the parallelism generates two verbs. Ezk. 29:5 and 32:4 refer to the land animals with *ḥayyaṯ hā'āreṣ,* and 39:4 uses *ḥayyaṯ haśśāḏeh.* Instead of "birds of the air," 39:4 uses the expression *'ēṭ ṣippôr kol-kānāp̄.*

3. *LXX.* For the root *ʿwp,* the LXX uses almost exclusively *pétomai* and *peteinón,* the latter usually in the pl. form *peteiná.*

III. Theological Meaning.

1. *Verb.* In theophany portrayals (Ps. 18:8-16[7-15] par. 2 S. 22:8-16), God's approach is described with, among other notions, that of flying *(ʿwp),* hovering *(d'h,* referring actually to the plunging of the raptor) on the wings of the wind *(rûaḥ),* and riding *(rkb)* on the cherub (v. 11[10]).[22] Even lacking an answer to the disputed question whether the cherub represents a personification of the storm clouds,[23] the use of *ʿwp* here is in any event connected with the expression *kan*ᵉ*p̄ê-rûaḥ.* Emphasis is on Yahweh's mighty, sovereign approach from his heavenly dwelling. "The procession of the ark . . . is transformed into an 'insane flight' through the cosmos, with the cherub changing into mighty winds."[24]

The flying seraphim in Isa. 6:2 are also to be viewed in the context of theophany. The four wings, with which according to ancient oriental traditions they are to protect the enthroned Deity, they now use to protect themselves from Yahweh's terrible power. The remaining two are used to hover above the Deity, which is nonsensical in this context, since Yahweh no longer needs their protection. In Isa. 6 these seraphim function only to emphasize all the more Yahweh's own holiness.[25]

In Sir. 43:14 the expression "and the clouds fly out like birds" emphasizes God's mightiness within the framework of creation. Isa. 31:5 uses the image of hovering birds to emphasize that God is intensely concerned with protecting Jerusalem. Yahweh protects Jerusalem the same way birds protect their nestlings by hovering above the nest.[26]

The verb *ʿwp* occurs in Hos. 9:11 in connection with judgment. Here the image of the scattering flock of birds qualifies the consequences of Ephraim's surrender to Baʿal. Just as a flock of birds scatters asunder, so also will Ephraim's *kāḇôḏ,* i.e., the quality and value of its life, be scattered because of its surrender to Baʿal. The singular occurrence of the expression "when I 'brandish' [let fly] my sword before them" (Ezk. 32:10) emphasizes the terrible power of God's judgment.

---

21. Weippert, 152.
22. → VII, 311f.
23. Cf. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1987), 260.
24. G. Ravasi, *Il libro dei Salmi I* (Bologna, 1981), 329f.
25. Cf. Keel, *Jahwe-Visionen,* 113; Ohler, 161.
26. Cf. H. Wildberger, *Jesaja (28–39). BK* X/3 (1982), 1243.

2. *Substantive.* a. *Creation.* Gen. 1:20-22 and 2:19 refer to winged creatures as God's creation, meaning that, like the rest of the world of creation, they are totally subject to God (Ps. 50:9-11). This is why it is impossible to extol a cult as if it were God's possibility for regeneration that one must or can accord to him.[27] Any representation of God's dominion in the dominant position God has granted to human beings will also encompass the world of winged creatures (Gen. 1:26,28; 2:19f.; 9:2). Commensurate with God's ideal concept of the world as the house of life in which life is protected, P believes that flying creatures, like all other creatures, are accorded "every green plant for food" (1:30).

Like all living creatures, so also are flying creatures threatened (6:7; 7:21,23); they are able to survive only because of God's own creative, saving bestowal of life (6:20; 7:3,8,14; 8:17,19); according to P, God's promise expressly establishes this for all that are thus protected and preserved: "This assurance requires no acceptance or approval of any kind. It is there in effect in the mere existence of animals in their species 'as long as the earth lasts.'"[28]

b. *Salvific Deeds in History.* In the poetic recapitulation of history in Ps. 78, Yahweh's guidance in history has manifested itself among other ways in "raining flesh upon them like dust, winged birds like the sand of the seas" (v. 27). Hos. 2:20(18) qualifies the end of this guidance, which is consummated in judgment and reestablishment, as a paradisiacal peace with both animals and the nations for the land of Israel and a life in absolute security and safety for Israel itself. Among the other animals, the creatures of flight are also solemnly charged with keeping the peace with Israel.[29]

c. *Judgment.* Hos. 7:12 elucidates the inevitability of Yahweh's judgment for Ephraim in the metaphor of the bird hunter. With regard to the Moabites, the gloss of Isa. 16:2 emphasizes that where Yahweh's judgment is implemented, the confusion and helplessness of those affected by the catastrophe can be described only with the image of "fluttering birds."[30] These birds can be the instruments of annihilating judgment or document the totality of destruction insofar as no one is left who might bury the dead (Dt. 28:26; 1 K. 14:11; 16:4; 21:24; Ps. 79:2; Jer. 7:33; 15:3; 16:4; 19:7; 34:20; Ezk. 29:5; 32:4). In Zeph. 1:3 the birds themselves are judged and entangled in the fate of all other living creatures.

The convulsions throughout the cosmos attending Yahweh's judgment theophany are manifested in the fleeing birds (*pars pro toto* for the entire animal world; Jer. 4:25) and in the quaking of the birds along with the whole animal world (Ezk. 38:20).

In connection with the fixed expression regarding the "mourning of the land,"[31] winged creatures appear along with the rest of the animal world in an intimate sharing of fate with human beings (Jer. 9:9[10]; 12:4; Hos. 4:3). Human transgressions throw the entire world of life and its surroundings out of kilter; birds languish (*'umlal,* Hos.

---

27. Cf. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59,* 493f.; Ravasi, *Il libro dei Salmi,* I, 907.
28. C. Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1984), 471.
29. Cf. J. Jeremias, *Der Prophet Hosea. ATD* 24/1 (1983), 49f.
30. Cf. O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1974), 70.
31. Cf. Hubmann, 139-43.

4:3), flee (*ndd*, Jer. 9:9), and are swept away (*sāpâ*, Jer. 12:4). Such occurrences can be either a warning or a symptom for sinful humanity, or can already signal the commencing day of judgment.

d. *Ecclesiastes*. Eccl. 10:20 warns against cursing the status quo even in one's thoughts, "for thoughts are inclined to become words, and words to find an ear."[32] The unique feature in this passage is that the birds betray what is spoken in secret. The OT does attest the notion that birds know more than other creatures (Job 28:21; cf. in this regard 28:7; 35:11), attributable probably to their ability to fly, which gives them enhanced mobility and thus multipresence. No other inner-biblical writings, however, state that birds pass along what they know to others.[33]

IV. Qumran. In the Qumran texts *'wp* hithpolel describes the deadly and accurate movement of the arrows of the pit (i.e., of death) threatening the petitioner (1QH 3:27) and the terrible approach of the annihilating waves (powers of chaos; 8:31). The substantive is used in the metaphorical description of the believer's tree of life, which offers a nesting place for birds (8:9), and in a prohibition against selling clean animals, including birds, to Gentiles (CD 12:9).

The Temple Scroll uses *'wp* in the purity regulations (11QT 48:3-6) commensurate with Lev. 11 and Dt. 14.[34] The concern with preserving the sanctuary's purity is extended to the area above the temple as well, into which no unclean bird may be permitted to intrude (11QT 46:1f.; cf. Josephus *B.J.* 5.6 §224). Finally, 11QT 30:15 is perhaps alluding to special arrangements for bird sacrifices in the sanctuary. Birds are mentioned as sacrifices only in the regulations concerning offerings in the fourth year (*hillûlîm*) alongside game and fish (60:4,8).

Stiglmair

32. Keel and Winter, *Vögel als Boten*, 97.
33. For extrabiblical witnesses see ibid., 99-102.
34. See II.2 above.

עור *'wr*

Contents: I. Etymology, Occurrences, Identification. II. Meaning: 1. Basic Meaning; 2. Situational Considerations. III. Theological Usage: 1. (Yahweh's) War; 2. Awakening. IV. Qumran.

'wr. R. Bach, *Die Aufforderung zur Flucht und zum Kampf im alttestamentlichen Prophetenspruch. WMANT* 9 (1962); H. Bardtke, *Der Erweckungsgedanke in der exilisch-nachexilischen*

I. Etymology, Occurrences, Identification. The root *'wr* is richly attested in the Semitic languages: Ugar. *'r* or *'rr,* "guard, stir up, excite"; *ǵr,* "be stirred up, excited" (?); Akk. *êru(m),* "awake"; Arab. *'arra* VI, "be restless" (in bed), *ǵyr,* "agitate, strive."[1] According to the concordances, *'wr* in the sense of "wake up, become agitated/excited," causatively "wake," occurs 77 or 78 times in the OT depending on whether one counts Hab. 3:9 or opts for *'rh,* "lay bare"; according to Lisowsky it occurs 21 times in the qal, 7 in the niphal, 12 in the pilel, 32 in the hiphil, 4 in the hithpael, and once in the pilpel. Yahweh is the subject in about 25 instances. This root is to be distinguished from *'wr,* "be blind,"[2] and *'ôr,* "skin," which is probably related to *'rh,* "expose, lay bare."

Nonetheless, 3 occurrences that are usually understood as meaning "wake up" remain problematic. Dt. 32:11 reads: "As an eagle stirs up its nest *(yā'îr),* and hovers over its young." The LXX translates this as *skepásai,* which makes good sense within the parallelism: Yahweh protects and guards Israel (v. 10) as an eagle does its nest and young. Hence some scholars (e.g., J. J. Stamm) have suspected the presence in v. 11 of a root *'ûr/'îr,* which, as in Ugaritic (see above), means "to guard"; cf. also CD 2:18, *'yry,* "(heavenly) watchers," and Biblical Aram. *'îr,* "(holy) watcher = angel" (Dnl. 4:10,14,20[Eng. vv. 13,17,23]; also 1QapGen ar [1Q20] 2:16). The MT (hiphil of *'wr*) also makes sense: When the eagle comes to the nest, it excites the young, who are expecting food.

Job 8:6 reads: "If you are pure and upright, surely then he will rouse himself for you and restore to you your rightful place." For "rouse" *(yā'îr)* one frequently translates "watch, guard," following the Ugaritic root; i.e., Yahweh watches over the righteous. Contextually, however, "rouse oneself, take action," fits just as well; i.e., Yahweh will surely reestablish the righteous petitioner Job (v. 5).[3]

Mal. 2:12 is difficult to interpret. "May Yahweh cut off from anyone who does this *'ēr wᵉ'ōneh,*" lit.: "one who watches and answers." W. Rudolph construes this according to *'îr* ("watch, guard") as "protector and dialogue partner."[4] The end of v. 11 involves mixed marriages with those of different faiths. Whoever enters into such a marriage shall be completely isolated. If one maintains the MT and the root *'wr,* which is certainly possible, the text is probably saying that such a man will find no one in all of Israel who will take action and speak (in his defense in court). An understanding of the 3 passages in the sense of "protect" is possible but not compelling. No corresponding meaning must be postulated for *'wr.*

Literatur des ATs. BZAW 77 (1958), 9-24; H. Fredriksson, *Jahwe als Krieger* (Lund, 1945); B. Hartmann, "Mögen die Götter dich behüten und unversehrt bewahren," *Hebräische Wortforschung. FS W. Baumgartner. SVT* 16 (1967), 102-5; H.-M. Lutz, *Jahwe, Jerusalem und die Völker. WMANT* 27 (1968); A. Oepke, "ἐγείρω," *TDNT,* II, 333-37; J. J. Stamm, "Ein ugaritisch-hebräisches Verbum und seine Ableitungen," *TZ* 35 (1979) 5-9; A. Weiser, "Das Deboralied," *ZAW* 71 (1959) 67-97.

1. See *HAL,* II, 802.
2. → עור *'iwwēr.*
3. G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), in loc.
4. W. Rudolph, *Haggai, Sacharja 1–8, Sacharja 9–14, Maleachi. KAT* XIII/4 (1976), in loc.

II. Meaning.

1. *Basic Meaning.* A survey of the use of ʿ*wr* suggests that its fundamental meaning is "to excite, stir up," in the sense of "become/make active such that someone or something becomes and remains engaged in some activity." This activation begins in the interior of the person in question, who either becomes active or is prompted to do so, the latter situation predominating (cf. pilpel, hiphil; less than a third of all occurrences are in the qal). It is usually Yahweh who prompts someone (or something) to become active.

2. *Situational Considerations.* One series of occurrences presupposes the situation of sleep and thus refers to waking or awakening. Ps. 44:24(Eng. v. 23), a lament of the people, addresses God: "Wake up *(ʿûrâ)!* Why do you sleep, O Lord? Awake *(hāqîṣâ),* do not cast us off forever!" Here God himself is being solicited to become active. Hab. 2:19 makes the same demand of the gods made of wood and stone, i.e., that they "wake up" (*qîṣ* hiphil) and "awaken" (ʿ*wr* qal). Ps. 73:20 remarks that at the sudden destruction of the wicked, they perish like a dream when one awakes (*qîṣ* hiphil), a dream whose image fades when one becomes active (ʿ*wr* hiphil). The *angelus interpres* wakens the visionary from the dream and sleep in which he has received the revelation (ʿ*wr* hiphil, Zec. 4:1), upon which the vision is then interpreted. Isa. 14:9 and Job 14:12 seem to be speaking about the sleep of death. For Job, who is speaking about the fate of death shared by all human beings, there is no resurrection *(qûm);* and as long as the world exists, which from the perspective of the author means never, we will neither wake up (*qîṣ* hiphil) nor be awakened (ʿ*wr* hiphil) from the sleep of death. According to Isa. 14:9, when the king of Babylon descends into the realm of death, that realm is stirred up to meet him, and the shadow entities become active (ʿ*wr* pilpel). In none of these passages does ʿ*wr* refer merely to awakening from sleep, for which the roots *qîṣ* hiphil and → יקץ *yqṣ* are used instead. The root ʿ*wr* refers rather to a condition of being stirred up into action, i.e., to a kind of second stage of awakening or of being awake after the actual activity of waking up.

This applies as well to Cant. 5:2, where the bride, awaiting the bridegroom, says that "I slept, but my heart was aroused *(ʿēr).*" The cry "Awake, O north wind" (4:16) is to be understood purely metaphorically, with the wind "sleeping" in the language of poetry. The meaning, of course, is that it would become active, i.e., start blowing. Nor do 2:7; 3:5; 8:4 refer to sleep in the literal sense, but rather to the two lovers being together at the consummation of their love. Contextually, ʿ*wr* is doubtless to be translated here as "disturb." Cant. 8:5 is probably using "awaken" to indicate that the partner is sexually aroused rather than awakened from actual sleep.

A condition of inactivity that is then brought to an end is either presupposed or constitutes the background for one series of passages. The creator God vanquishes and then condemns to inactivity Leviathan, the monster of chaos; according to Job 3:8, however, conjurers are allegedly able to reactivate Leviathan such that chaos once again descends. Job would like to see his own existence utterly extinguished, and in his lament uses this daring metaphor. The crocodile is terrifying even when it is resting, and no one is daring enough to stir it up (Job 41:2[10]; read hiphil of ʿ*wr* with *K* instead

of qal). The term *'wr* is also used in reference to objects and things that are put into motion or rendered active. 2 S. 23:18 recounts that Abishai put his spear into action and killed three hundred men with it. According to 1 Ch. 11:11, Jashobeam did the same. A salvific oracle for Zion uses similar imagery to say that Yahweh will activate his chastising whip against Assyria (Isa. 10:26). The usual translation here is to "wield the sword/whip." The reference, however, is more to what these weapons actually do when put into motion or, as it were, prompted to act. Zec. 13:7 suggests this understanding when it commands, "Awake, O sword, rise up *('ûrî)* against my shepherd." The sword then acts independently. Hos. 7:4 speaks of the fire in the baker's oven. The baker does not "stir it up" or fan the flames when he prepares the dough for baking. It becomes genuinely activated only when the dough is ready. The adulterers are compared with the heated oven in which desire burns while they await the appropriate opportunity.

Literal rather than metaphorical usage is intended when *'wr* is used in reference to persons. In a fundamental wisdom explanation probably representing an addendum (vv. 8-10), Job 17:8 asserts that the innocent stir themselves up *(yiṯ'ōrār)* because of the godless. According to the MT, he insists in his declaration of innocence (31:29: hithpolel of *'wr*) that he did not get excited when evil overtook his enemy. Given the context, this must refer to joyous exultation or excitement (often emended to the hithpolel of *rw'*, "exult"). In an oracle of salvation, Deutero-Isaiah (51:17) charges Jerusalem, the personified city as the community of the Lord, to rouse itself (*'wr* hithpolel) and stand up *(qûm)* after having drunk the cup of wrath of divine judgment and having lain stunned on the ground. It is to raise itself up (52:1 with double impv. *'ûrî*) and put on the garment of its power, i.e., become active once again after God's salvific beneficence. Trito-Isaiah (64:6[7]) confesses in prayer that no one rises up to hold fast to Yahweh. The psalmist (57:9[8]; 108:3[2]) summons both himself *(kᵉḇôḏî)*[5] and the harp and lyre to sing God's praises; standing at the beginning of hymnic praise, this indicates that he is now about to begin. The volume and length of an utterance can apparently also be expressed by a form of *'wr*. According to Isa. 15:5, the defeated Moabites keep the "cry of destruction" active. In Jgs. 5:12 Deborah is summoned with a fourfold impv. *'ûrî* to sing the victory song after the victory of the tribal coalition under Barak; this may be a reference to the commencement of the cultic victory procession. Barak himself is summoned with *qûm*. The text does not say whether a corresponding summons was issued in the cultic thanksgiving liturgy (cf. Ps. 57:9[8]).

In the context of war and military campaigns, the nations are said to become active and set out for battle. Jer. 6:22, which sees the enemy setting off from the north, announces disaster to its people. Again from the north, though this time also from the farthest parts of the earth, a great people set out together with many kings to visit punishment on Babylon (Jer. 50:41). In a *vaticinium ex eventu* (Dnl. 11:2), the angel tells the visionary Daniel that the fourth king of Persia will begin a war against the Greeks; he engages *(yā'îr)* everything, his wealth and his power, against the kingdom of *yāwān*.

---

5. → כבוד *kāḇôḏ*, VII, 24.

Following the LXX in reading the qal here would require that one emend MT *hakkōl* to *hakkōṯ* ("to defeat" the kingdom of *yāwān*). The reader clearly sees that this involves a war.

Finally, a wisdom text can be mentioned that addresses interpersonal relationships in general: "Hatred stirs up strife, but love covers all offenses" (Prov. 10:12). Hatred prompts disputes; it is what makes them violent, and it is always looking for an opportunity to stir them up.

III. Theological Usage. The term *'wr* occurs frequently (about 25 times) in more strictly theological usage, i.e., with Yahweh as the agent.

1. *(Yahweh's) War.* Such usage usually involves a situation of war or clearly presupposes war as its background. Whenever Israel's God is involved in military events, one thinks immediately of the theme of Yahweh's war; what is known as holy war of the sort in which Yahweh fights for his people during the exodus, land conquest, or the period of the judges. Joel 4:9(3:9) provides a commensurate context: "Proclaim this among the nations: Prepare holy war *(qaddᵉšû milḥāmâ),* stir up the warriors *(hā'îrû)!*" Although the imperatives in Joel 4:9ff.(3:9ff.) may allow one to conclude the presence of a genre "call to battle,"[6] it remains uncertain whether such a genre derives from the theme of holy war itself or was transferred there from secular usage. It is here, however, that the call to become active *('wr)* has its place; the initiative comes from Yahweh. It is also uncertain whether prophets participated in this and whether they issued this summons already during the classical period of the Yahweh war. Deborah does not qualify as proof (see above). The late text Joel 4:9(3:9) turns the older prophetic statements about the Lord's activity in war into a promise of salvation. Yahweh announces that the nations are to set out (*'wr* niphal) and come to the valley of Jehoshaphat (v. 12), where he will judge them. They are summoned not to fight but to be destroyed.

The cultic song brings to expression the notion that Israel's God stands on the side of his people in the Yahweh war, rises up *('wr),* and fights for them. Ps. 80:3(2), composed perhaps after the fall of the northern kingdom, petitions the Lord to awaken his mighty power and hasten to the aid of his people. After a harsh defeat, a lament of the people (44:24[23]) pleads with him to rise up himself as an active warrior and not to cast off his people and deliver them over to destruction through his own inactivity. Isa. 10:26 anticipates his taking action against Assyria and recalls how he once defeated Midian at the rock of Oreb (cf. Jgs. 7:25). In his victory song Deutero-Isaiah hopes that the salvific God will go forth into battle like a soldier and awaken his fury like a warrior (Isa. 42:13). The background to this general war terminology is the announcement of the new exodus introduced by this song. The individual, too, expresses the petition for deliverance with reference to the theme of God's military campaign against the enemy, the point of departure being the assumption that one's own enemies are also Yahweh's enemies, and that Yahweh will thus come to the aid of the innocent op-

---

6. See Bach.

pressed person. He should take action in judgment (Ps. 7:7[6]). Reference to the nations (vv. 7f.[6f.]; cf. 59:5f.[4f.], where the oppressed individual also feels threatened by the nations) as well as use of the term *'wr* deriving from the terminology of war shows that the oppressed are appealing to the salvific God who takes action and fights on behalf of his believers.

Judgment prophecy turns the Yahweh war into its opposite. Rather than intervene and take positive action on behalf of his people, God activates foreign nations that now fight beside him against Israel. This is the case when they set out with his approval and prepare for an assault (Jer. 6:22; 25:32). He rouses enemies against faithless Judah (Ezk. 23:22) just as he does other peoples against Babylon (Jer. 50:9; 51:1,11). This directly attributes to Yahweh himself any initiative and plan made by Israel's enemies in entering into war against Israel. His rousing of enemies is his means of chastising his people. The Chronicler uses this perspective to point out that Yahweh punished King Jehoram because of his connection with the house of Ahab (2 Ch. 21:16) and to explain the disappearance of the Transjordanian tribes (1 Ch. 5:26). Of course, God can also employ this means against other nations (Babylon). He remains the Lord of history even within the most secret thoughts in the hearts of the mighty; indeed, he has been a warrior God from the very outset (cf. Isa. 51:9).

This also applies to the Persian Cyrus even though the military context, though certainly present (Isa. 41:2), recedes in favor of the activation of Israel's savior. Yahweh has awakened him (41:2), placed him into a global framework (41:25), and started him down his predetermined, predestined path. This salvific prophecy, however, is concerned with the exiles in Babylon being freed once more and with Jerusalem, which had been destroyed, being rebuilt. To this end and as an act of his salvific righteousness, the Lord prompted Cyrus to take action (45:13).

The announcement of salvation also includes two contradictory texts from Zechariah. According to Zec. 2:17(13), Yahweh rouses himself and sets out (*'wr* niphal) from his holy place, his heavenly dwelling, doubtless in order to assume his dominion by taking peaceful possession of his people and land. This benefits not only his own people, in whose midst he now dwells, but also the Gentiles. Zec. 9:13, a late text dating probably from the age of the Diadochi, picks up the imagery from 2 S. 23:18. In the decisive battle of the people of God with its adversaries, Yahweh uses Judah as his bow, Ephraim as his arrow, and Zion as the lance he wields (*'wr* pilpel; or as a sword: cf. Zec. 13:7). The background here is the hostile world power. It is not quite clear just how the Lord activates his people and with their help attains victory. The passage uses terminology from the Yahweh war only figuratively and metaphorically. The same applies to Ps. 78:38, which is to be read as *yā'îr* with the MT. Yahweh did not stir up his wrath in punishing his people by means of its enemies; i.e., he is so much the salvific God that he must first activate his wrath before he judges.

2. *Awakening.* Those whom Yahweh uses as instruments he activates in their interior. He rouses the *rûaḥ* of the person in question: of the destroyer (Jer. 51:1), the kings of the Medes (Jer. 51:11), Zerubbabel (Hag. 1:14), Tiglath-pilneser (1 Ch. 5:26), and

Cyrus (2 Ch. 36:22; Ezr. 1:1,5). It is in this way that he prompts them to take action depending on whether he is planning disaster or salvation, either of which those he chooses then carry out. Although this sort of inner process may be called awakening, it is not, even in the case of Cyrus, religious in nature except perhaps in the case of Zerubbabel and his companions (Hag. 1:14), since they do build the temple, following thus the prophetically announced will of God. By contrast, the awakening of Yahweh's pupil is doubtless to be understood as religious (Isa. 50:4). Every morning the Lord wakens his ear, obviously to receive the word so that this prophet can himself awaken through God's word those who lack courage.

One should note that the OT does not use *'wr* in connection with the resurrection of the dead. Isa. 26:19 and Dnl. 12:2, the only unequivocal statements, use *qûm* and *qîṣ*, respectively.

IV. Qumran. The writings of Qumran use *'wr,* "wake up, rouse," only sporadically. Concerning CD 2:18, see I above. The term does not occur in 1QM even though, given OT usage, one might expect it. CD 19:7 uses it in a citation from Zec. 13:7, and CD 8:17 is to be read *h'ydw* ("who bore witness"), following 19:30. 1QH 6:29 and 9:3 follow the terminology of the Yahweh war, though the meaning and reference in 9:3 are unclear.

Schreiner

עִוֵּר *'iwwēr;* **עור** *'wr* I. **עַוֶּרֶת** *'awweret;* **עִוָּרוֹן** *'iwwārôn;* **סַנְוֵרִים** *sanwērîm;* **שׁעע** *š''*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. OT Occurrences; 3. LXX. II. OT Usage: 1. Concrete Usage; 2. Figurative Usage; 3. Blindness as a Result of Divine Wrath; 4. The Verb *'wr;* 5. *sanwērîm.* III. Qumran. IV. The Hardening of Israel.

'iwwēr. A. Ahuvya, "On the Meaning of the Word סַנְוֵרִים," *Tarbiz* 39 (1969/70) 90-92; F. C. Fensham, "Note on Keret in CTA 14:90-103a," *JNSL* 8 (1980) 35-47; K. Galling, "Der Ehrenname Elisas und die Entrückung Elias," *ZTK* 53 (1956) 129-48, esp. 136f.; G. Gerleman, "Bemerkungen zur Terminologie der 'Blindheit' im AT (פִּקַּח-עִוֵּר)," *SEÅ* 41/42 (1976/77) 77-80; W. Herrmann, *Das Wunder in der evangelischen Botschaft: Zur Interpretation der Begriffe blind und taub im Alten und Neuen Testament. Aufsätze und Vorträge zur Theologie und Religionswissenschaft* 20 (Berlin, 1961) 7-14; H. Holma, *Die Namen der Körperteile im Assyrisch-Babylonischen; eine lexikalisch-etymologische Studie* (Helsinki, 1911), 15, 171; idem, *Die assyrische-babylonischen Personennamen der Form* quttulu *mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Wörter für Körperfehler* (Helsinki, 1914), 28, 56f.; A. Jirku, *Materialien zur Volksreligion Israels* (Leipzig, 1914), 65-78; C. Rabin, "A Note on the Article 'On the Meaning of the Word סַנְוֵרִים,'" *Tarbiz* 39 (1969/70) 214f.; G. Rinaldi, "*'awwéret,*" *BibOr* 9 (1967) 196; W. Schrage, "τυφλός, τυφλόω," *TDNT,* VIII, 270-94; H. J. Stoebe, "Blendung," *BHHW,* I, 256f.; idem, "Blind, Blindheit," *BHHW,* I, 257f.

I. 1. *Etymology.* The root *ʿwr* I in the sense of "blind" or "one-eyed" is attested in Ugaritic (*ʿwr,* "blind, one-eyed"; *ʿwrt,* "blindness"),[1] Arabic (*ʿawira,* 'be one-eyed"), Aramaic (adj.; verb in pael), and Ethiopic (*ʿōra,* "be blind"). Although the stem does not occur in Akkadian, H. Holma nonetheless tried to identify it first in *tûrtu,* which in the expression *tûrti ênā* means approximately "blindness," deriving allegedly from an earlier form *taʿawartu,* and then in the Old Babylonian PN *ḫummuru,* which allegedly contains an allusion to blindness.[2] The term *ḫummuru,* however, is richly attested in Akkadian as an adjective, and means not "blind" but "crippled, lame"; and *tûrtu* derives according to *AHw* from *târu,* "turn around, reverse."[3]

Wächter

The customary derivation of *sanwērîm* from the Semitic root *nwr* is untenable because no analogy exists for the assumed nominal form and because the meaning is incompatible with *nwr.* This word in fact represents a foreign word from a non-Semitic language in a Hebrew plural form perhaps better vocalized as *sinnūrîm.* It is related to other Akkadian words of similarly foreign derivation referring to severe visual handicaps: *sillurmû* with the artificially constructed secondary form *Sîn-lurmá,* "weak sighted" or "(severely) visually handicapped at night" and probably also "night blindness," and the approximate synonym *sinnurbû(m)* with the secondary forms *sinnūru* and *Sîn-nurmiātim.*[4] Although *sanwērîm* was later misunderstood as "blindness," witnesses and the rendering *aorasía* in the LXX suggest a severe but temporary visual handicap leading to a loss of orientation. We have no way of determining the fundamental meaning of these words.

von Soden

2. *OT Occurrences.* The term *ʿiwwēr,* "blind," occurs 26 times in the OT, the verb *ʿwr* piel 5 times, the noun *ʿawwereṯ* once, and the noun *ʿiwwārôn,* "blinding, blindness," twice. The semantically related noun *sanwērîm* occurs 3 times.

3. *LXX.* The LXX almost always translates the adj. *ʿiwwēr* with *typhlós;* verbal derivatives occur in Isa. 42:19 and 56:10. The text in Jer. 31:8 and Lam. 4:14 deviates completely. The noun *ʿawwereṯ* is rendered as *typhlós.* The verb *ʿwr* piel is translated as *ektyphlóō.* The term *ʿiwwārôn* is rendered once as *apotýphlōsis* (Zec. 12:4) and once as *aorasía* (Dt. 28:28), the latter translation also being chosen for *sanwērîm.* Other LXX occurrences of *aorasía* are 2 Mc. 10:30 and Wis. 19:17.

II. OT Usage.

1. *Concrete Usage.* Blindness is one physical handicap among others, and the OT laws advise consideration with regard to it. Lev. 19:14 charges: "You shall not revile

1. *WUS,* no. 2020.
2. *Körperteile,* 15, 171; idem, *Personennamen,* 56f.
3. See, respectively, *AHw,* I, 355; III, 1332ff., 1373.
4. See *AHw,* II, 1044a and 1048a, as well as, with emendations, *CAD,* XVI, 285b, 294a.

the deaf *(ḥērēš)*[5] or put a stumbling block before the blind." Dt. 27:18 emphasizes especially the latter. Job (29:15) boasts of his own willingness to help the blind and the lame *(pissēaḥ)*. Such consideration in daily life, however, corresponded to neglect in the cultic sphere. Lev. 21:18 enumerates blindness and lameness among the first physical defects excluding a person from the priesthood. The same thinking recognizes blindness as a blemish excluding an animal from sacrifice (Lev. 22:22; Dt. 15:21; Mal. 1:8; cf. 11QT 52:10).

2 S. 5:6-8 speaks repeatedly about lameness and blindness as physical defects or flaws. The final verse (v. 8), "the blind and the lame shall not come into the house," might refer to the palace or, even more likely, to the temple, an interpretation supported by the LXX, which translates with *eis oíkon kyríou*, and by scriptural passages where *bayiṯ* does refer to the "temple" (Ezk. 41:5ff.; Mic. 3:12; Hag. 1:8). This axiom is then following Lev. 21:18 in stipulating that the blind and the lame are not permitted to perform priestly service.

Nonetheless, Jer. 31:8 asserts that the blind and the lame will be among those whom Yahweh leads back in the time of salvation.

2. *Figurative Usage.* Yahweh can make a person "mute *(ʾillēm)* or deaf, seeing or blind" (Ex. 4:11). Similarly, "Yahweh sets the prisoners free; Yahweh opens the eyes of the blind" *(pōqēaḥ ʿiwrîm)*. Here external and internal, spiritual seeing merge, as they certainly do in later sections of the book of Isaiah, beginning with 29:18: "On that day the deaf shall hear the words of a scroll, and out of their gloom and darkness the eyes of the blind shall see." Isa. 35:5; 42:18,19; 43:8 also mention spiritual blindness and deafness. God can free a person from spiritual blindness (42:7,16). When it refers to the sentinels as blind and as silent dogs, Isa. 56:10 has a different focus: those who want neither to see nor to speak.

3. *Blindness as a Result of Divine Wrath.* Blindness and loss of orientation can also be understood as resulting from God's punishment or wrath (Dt. 28:29; Isa. 59:10; Lam. 4:14; Zeph. 1:17). Those struck by this wrath are said to grope around at midday as do the blind in the darkness (Dt. 28:29). The 2 occurrences of *ʿiwwārôn* belong in this context. Dt. 28:28 asserts that "Yahweh will afflict you with madness *(šiggāʿôn)*, blindness *(ʿiwwārôn)*, and confusion of mind *(timhôn lēḇāḇ)*." Flanked by "madness" and "confusion of mind," *ʿiwwārôn* here refers to utter loss of orientation of the sort then described in v. 29. The same nouns, albeit now referring to Israel's enemies, also occur in Zec. 12:4, which is itself dependent on Dt. 28:28.

4. *The Verb ʿwr.* The verb *ʿwr* piel, "to blind, make blind," is used figuratively in Ex. 23:8 and Dt. 16:19, two virtually identical passages. Bribes blind the eyes (so Dt. 16:19) or those who see (so Ex. 23:8). The verb exhibits its direct meaning in the account of Zedekiah's blinding by the king of Babylon (2 K. 25:7; Jer. 39:7; 52:11): "He made the

5. → דמה *dāmâ (dāmāh)* II (III, 260-65).

eyes of Zedekiah blind." Elsewhere the verb *nqr,* "put out," makes this act of blinding concrete, either in the qal (1 S. 11:2; Prov. 30:17) or piel (Nu. 16:14; Jgs. 16:21).

5. *sanwērîm.* The term *sanwērîm* is probably an abstract plural[6] referring, similar to *'iwwārôn,* to loss of orientation and blindness. Gen. 19:11 recounts how the divine messengers strike with *sanwērîm* those who try to seize Lot, "so that they were unable to find the door." Similarly in 2 K. 6:18, the prophet Elisha asks God to strike the advancing Arameans with *sanwērîm.* When this indeed happens, the Arameans are utterly without orientation, are unable even to recognize the prophet, and he succeeds in leading them astray to Samaria (v. 19).

III. Qumran. The Qumran texts essentially use the root *'wr* commensurate with OT usage. 1QM 7:4 stipulates that neither the lame nor the blind may participate in (holy) war; those excluded largely coincide with those the OT excludes from priestly service. According to 1QSa 2:6, the lame, blind, deaf, and mute are among those not admitted to the community of respected men (cf. 11QT 45:12). CD 1:9 uses the term *'iwwēr* figuratively (alluding to Isa. 59:10).

1QS 4:11 mentions blindness of eye *('iwrôn 'ênayim)* and dullness of ear *(kibbûḏ 'ôzen)* among those things that are part of the spirit of falsehood. According to CD 16:2-3, the time of the blinding of Israel *('iwrôn yiśrā'ēl)* is precisely predetermined.

Wächter

IV. The Hardening of Israel. Only in the Isaianic tradition of the commission for the hardening of Israel's heart (Isa. 6:10; 29:9) does the verb *š''* occur, referring to blindness under the aspect of guilt and sin. The prophet receives the following commission: "Make the mind of this people dull, and stop their ears, and shut *(hāša')* their eyes so that they may not look with their eyes and listen with their ears." The semantic scope of this word depends essentially on the understanding of the commission itself.[7]

Fabry

6. D. Michel, *Grundlegung einer hebräischen Syntax* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1977), I, 88.
7. → לב *lēḇ* (VII, 399-437); cf. R. Kilian, *Jesaja 1–39. EdF* 200 (1983), 112-30.

עֵז *'ēz*

Contents: I. 1. Etymology; 2. Occurrences; 3. Meaning; 4. LXX. II. 1. Secular Usage; 2. Comparison and Symbolism. III. Religious Usage: 1. Dietary Laws; 2. Sacrificial Animals; 3. Gen. 15:9. IV. Qumran.

I. 1. *Etymology.* "The word is . . . universally Semitic" and is attested in Biblical Aramaic, Punic, Palmyrene *(ʿz),* Syriac *(ʿezzā),* and Amorite *(ḫazzum).*[1] The nonassimilated form *ʿnz* occurs in Arabic *(ʿanz),* Egyptian Aramaic, Akkadian (*enzu* alongside *ezzu*), and perhaps also in Ethiopic and Egyptian *(ʿnḫ).*[2] Whether it derives from original *ʿanzu* or *ʿinzu*[3] is just as disputed as is the question whether the noun derives from the postulated root *ʿnz* or from *ʿzz,* "be strong," "be impudent."[4] It is more likely that *ʿēz* is a primary noun.

2. *Occurrences.* The term *ʿēz* occurs 74 times in the Hebrew and once (Ezr. 6:17) in the Aramaic part of the OT: 25 times in Numbers, 12 in Leviticus, 11 in Genesis, 7 in Exodus, 4 each in Judges and 1 Samuel, twice each in Ezekiel, Canticles, Daniel, and 2 Chronicles, and once each in Deuteronomy, 1 Kings, Proverbs, and Ezra. To these one can add an occurrence in Ugaritic and several witnesses in Punic and Aramaic texts.[5]

3. *Meaning.* The occurrence of *ʿz* together with *š,* "sheep," and *ṯʾt,* "mother ewe," in the short Ugaritic text clearly confirms the meaning "goat"; similarly, the OT also subdivides small livestock into sheep and goats (Lev. 1:10; Nu. 15:11; cf. Dt. 14:4; 1 S. 25:2). In contradistinction to sheep, which require several differentiating terms, *ʿēz* can refer without distinction to both male and female animals (cf. Gen. 31:38; Lev. 4:28; 5:6; Nu. 15:27; 18:17; Prov. 27:27).[6] Greater precision requires additional words: combinations with → גדי *g^eḏî,* "kid" (Gen. 27:9,16; 38:17,20; Jgs. 6:19; 13:15,19; 15:1; 1 S. 16:20), with *ś^eʿîr,* "billy goat, male goat," particularly in texts of P (Gen. 37:31; Lev.

ʿēz. F. S. Bodenheimer, *Animal Life in Palestine* (Jerusalem, 1935), 124f.; B. Brentjes, *Die Haustierwerdung im Orient. Neue Brehm-Bücherei* 344 (1965), 22-29; J. Clutton-Brock, "The Early History of Domesticated Animals in Western Asia," *Sumer* 36 (1980) 37-41; G. Dalman, *AuS,* V, 4f., 17f., et passim; VI, 196-203; P. Ducos, "Les débuts de l'élevage en Palestine," *Syr* 44 (1967) 375-400; G. F. Hasel, "The Meaning of the Animal Rite in Genesis 15," *JSOT* 19 (1981) 61-78; M.-L. Henry, "Ziege," *BHHW,* III, 2237; A. S. Kapelrud, "The Interpretation of Jeremiah 34,18ff.," *JSOT* 22 (1982) 138-41; R. Rendtorff, *Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. WMANT* 24 (1967); G. J. Wenham, "The Symbolism of the Animal Rite in Genesis 15," *JSOT* 22 (1982) 134-37.

1. M. Noth, *Die Ursprünge des alten Israel im Lichte neuer Quellen. Veröffentlichungen der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen* 94 = *ABLAK,* II, 269; see *AHw,* I, 339; cf. *HAL,* II, 804f.

2. Cf. *DNSI,* II, 835; *AHw,* I, 221.

3. For the former see Meyer, II, §51, 2a; for the latter, J. Friedrich and W. Röllig, *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik. AnOr* 46 (1970), §195a.

4. For the former see E. König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache,* 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1881-97), II, 38; for the latter, Dalman, *AuS,* VI, 196; cf. *HAL,* II, 804.

5. For Ugaritic see *KTU,* 1.80, 4; cf. *WUS,* no. 2022; and O. Eissfeldt, "The Alphabetical Cuneiform Texts from Ras Shamra published 1963 in 'Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit' Vol. II 1957," *KlSchr,* II (1963), 399. For Punic see *CIS,* I, 165, 7 (= *KAI,* 69:7); 167, 4 (= *KAI,* 74:4); 3915, 2. For Aramaic see *AP,* 33:10; Ahiqar 118 (bis), 119 etc.; cf. *DNSI,* II, 835.

6. Concerning the following discussion, cf. also *AuS,* VI, 196f.

4:23; 9:3; 16:5; 23:19; Nu. 7:16,22,28,34,40,46,52,58,64,70,76,82,87; 28:15,30; 29:5,11,16,19,25; Ezk. 43:22; 45:23) or with *śᵉʿîraṯ,* "female goat" (Lev. 4:28; 5:6; cf. also → שָׂעִיר *śāʿîr* III, "goat demon"[7]), with *ṣᵉpîr,* "male goat" (2 Ch. 29:21; Ezr. 6:17; Dnl. 8:5,8), and with *bᵉnê,* "kids" (2 Ch. 35:7). The term *ʿattûḏ* means both "ram" and "male goat." Finally, this word also means "goat's hair" (Ex. 25:4; 26:7; 35:6,23,26; 36:14; Nu. 31:20).

4. *LXX.* The LXX translation largely does justice to this multiplicity of meanings. The most frequent rendering of *ʿēz* is *aíx;* Ex. 12:5 and Lev. 1:10 use *ériphos,* which as *ériphos aigṓn* stands for *gᵉḏî ʿizzîm* (Gen. 38:17,20; Jgs. 13:15,19; 6:19; 15:1; 1 S. 16:20) and for *śᵉʿîr ʿizzîm* (Gen. 37:31; Ezk. 43:22; 45:23), though the latter is generally translated by *chímaros (chímaira) ex aigṓn* (e.g., Lev. 4:23,28, etc.). Only Gen. 27:9 and 16 translate *gᵉḏî ʿizzîm* with simple *ériphos.* Dnl. 8:5 and 8 translate *ṣᵉpîr ʿizzîm* as *trágos (tṓn) aigṓn,* and 2 Ch. 35:7 renders *bᵉnê ʿizzîm* as *tékna tṓn aigṓn.* The LXX renders the meaning "goat's hair" as *aígeia* (Nu. 31:20), *thríx aígeia* (Ex. 25:4; 35:6,23), *dérmata aígeia* (35:23), or by circumscribing it as *dérris trichínē* (26:7). The LXX translates Prov. 27:27 differently, and lacks Ex. 36:14 altogether.

II. 1. *Secular Usage.* Goats are classified among small livestock (Gen. 31:38) and are part of an Israelite's property. Nabal's enormous wealth is measured by his three thousand sheep and one thousand goats (1 S. 25:2). In the contract between Jacob and Laban, both sheep and goats also play a role insofar as the reader is told twice in slightly altered form how Jacob's wealth was increased through the considerable increase of speckled and spotted goats (Gen. 30:32f.,35).[8] Their value is also reflected in Jacob's gift to Esau, which includes two hundred goats (32:15[Eng. v. 14]). Judah sends Tamar the promised kid as a fee (38:17,20). Samson brings one to his wife as a gift (Jgs. 15:1), Anna receives one as an additional gift (Tob. 2:12,14), and David is sent to Saul "with a donkey loaded with bread, a skin of wine, and a kid" (1 S. 16:20).

The sign of special honor for a respected guest is to serve a kid at the meal (Jgs. 13:15). Two kids prepared as game help deceive Isaac (Gen. 27:9). That goat flesh was eaten otherwise as well is confirmed by the prohibition against boiling a kid in its mother's milk (Ex. 23:19; 34:26; Dt. 14:21).[9] The reference is thus to goat's milk, which was also an essential part of the Israelites' food sources (Prov. 27:27).[10] Women wove the tent fabric for the tabernacle from spun black goat's hair (Ex. 25:4; 26:7;

---

7. Cf. also N. H. Snaith, "The Meaning of *śᵉʿîrîm,*" *VT* 25 (1975) 115-18.

8. → לח *laḥ* (VII, 512-17).

9. → גְּדִי *gᵉḏî (gᵉdhî),* II, 387ff. Cf. O. Keel, *Das Böcklein in der Milch seiner Mutter und Verwandtes. OBO* 33 (1980), who addresses this from the perspective of taboo; cf. the dissenting view of M. Haran, "Das Böcklein in der Milch seiner Mutter und das säugende Muttertier," *TZ* 41 (1985) 135-59, who suggests rather the presence of a humanistic sensibility based on moral considerations.

10. Cf. *AuS,* VI, 199f.

35:6,23,26; 36:14),[11] just as they probably also made their own tent fabric and carpets from such material (cf. Cant. 1:5). Nu. 31:20 suggests that other personal items were also made of goat's hair.[12] Isaac is deceived by means of finessed use of goatskins (Gen. 27:16), and Michal probably also used a piece of goatskin in deceiving Saul's messengers with the clothed teraphim (1 S. 19:13).[13] Finally, Joseph's brothers fake his death by dipping his robe in the blood of a slaughtered goat (Gen. 37:31).

2. *Comparison and Symbolism.* Twice the OT uses goats in metaphorical comparisons. 1 K. 20:27 compares the terrifyingly small number of Israelite warriors over against the numerous Arameans with "two little flocks of goats."[14] Cant. 4:1 and 6:5 compare the luxuriant black hair of the beloved with "a flock of goats, moving down the slopes of Gilead."

A male goat symbolizes the Hellenistic power in Dnl. 8:5 and 8, and is portrayed as a mighty animal coming from the west and overrunning the ram.[15]

III. Religious Usage.

1. *Dietary Laws.* Just as goats were among the first animals to be domesticated in the Near East,[16] the early traditions in Gen. 27 and 38 as well as witnesses in Judges show that from the outset they were also among the domesticated animals that the Israelites and their ancestors kept as livestock for slaughter and food. When Dt. 14:4 mentions goats after the ox and sheep in beginning the list of edible animals, it is merely stating in the stylistic form of imperative torah instruction[17] what was already long familiar to the Israelites, and elevating into the status of law what had already long been the custom. This probably also applies to laws affecting slaughter at the beginning of the Holiness Code (Lev. 17:3), which uses the same sequence of ox, sheep, and goat. The same series recurs in the sacrificial laws (Lev. 7:23; 22:27; Nu. 18:17; cf. the sequence of sacrificial animals in the Punic sacrificial tariff: ox, calf and ram, wether and goat, lamb and kid and young ram[18]) and consistently exhibits the influence of P. Materially Lev. 17:1-7 does, however, require that the slaughter of sacrificial animals be carried out no longer in a secular fashion but as it were cultically, the blood now being brought to Yahweh's altar such that it might no longer run out "on the ground like water" (Dt. 12:15f.,20-27). It is doubtful such a requirement could have been implemented.[19] The prohibition against eating the fat of these animals is similarly spurious (Lev. 7:23). This prohibition, too, may be connected

---

11. → אהל *'ōhel* (I, 118-30).

12. Cf. *AuS,* V, 1, 4f., 17f.; VI, 30, who also points out that the *śaq* as a mourning garment (V, 165, 202) and the prophet's cloak (V, 248) were woven from goat's hair.

13. So H. J. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis. KAT* VIII/1 (1973), 356-58; a different view is taken by Dalman, *AuS,* VI, 200: "weave made of goat's hair."

14. *HAL,* I, 359.

15. Cf. A. Wünsche, *Die Bildersprache des ATs* (1906), 53.

16. Cf. Brentjes, Ducos, and Clutton-Brock.

17. G. von Rad, *Deuteronomy. OTL* (Eng. trans. 1966), in loc.

18. *KAI,* 69; 74; *ANET,* 656f.

19. So, correctly, K. Elliger, *Leviticus. HAT* IV (1966), 226.

with Lev. 17:6, which requires that the fat of the sacrificial animals be presented as an offering for Yahweh, a practice apparently not strictly followed in the earlier period (cf. Gen. 4:4; Dt. 32:14; Ps. 63:6[5]).[20]

2. *Sacrificial Animals.* Jgs. 6 and 13 show how closely connected during Israel's early period the notion of honoring a guest was with the notion of offering sacrifices to Yahweh. Manoah intends to offer a kid to his guest, whom he does not recognize as Yahweh's angel (13:15). The angel, however, instructs Manoah to present it as a burnt offering to Yahweh instead, which Manoah then does (v. 19). The Gideon narrative describes this procedure from the outset as a symbolic sacrificial act (6:19-21; similarly also 1 K. 18:38). Hence H. J. Stoebe's suspicion is certainly well founded that David's gift for Saul, consisting of among other things also a kid (1 S. 16:20), actually derives from the notion of sacrifice insofar as "what originally was offered directly to God is now given first to the king."[21]

Whatever its origin, the Passover celebration apparently always included a meal consisting of an animal from the small livestock. While Ex. 12:21 speaks only in a general fashion about "small livestock," P differentiates and precisely stipulates that the Passover lamb is to be without blemish, a year-old male animal chosen from among the sheep or goats (Ex. 12:5). Commensurately, according to 2 Ch. 35:7, at Passover Josiah contributes to the people "lambs and kids from the flock."

Ezk. 45:21-25 prescribes different terms for future Passover celebrations after the return from the exile. On each of the seven festival days, sacrifices will include among other animals also a male goat as a sin offering.[22] The prophet's instructions for dedicating the altar of burnt offering are similar: On the second day, a male goat without blemish is to be offered as a sin offering (Ezk. 43:22). W. Zimmerli has correctly pointed out that this atonement for the altar corresponds essentially to the regulations in Lev. 16:18f., where the altar is cleansed from the Israelites' impurity and consecrated for normal sacrificial service through the blood of two sacrificial animals.[23] In any event, the Chronicler has King Hezekiah, accompanied by his official after the cleansing of the temple, go up to the temple and sacrifice seven bulls, rams, lambs, and male goats as a sin offering, rendering the normal Yahweh cult possible again (2 Ch. 29:21). After construction is completed on the second temple, the consecration includes the sacrifice of bulls, rams, and lambs as well as twelve male goats as a sin offering according to the number of Israel's tribes (Ezr. 6:17).

In general one notices that texts influenced by or closely related to P also include goats as sin offerings, commensurate with the way the priestly "school theology . . . understands the entire sacrificial cult as an institution of atonement."[24] This does not pre-

---

20. → חֵלֶב *ḥēleḇ (chēlebh),* IV, 392ff.

21. Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis,* 312; cf. Stoebe, "1 Sam. VIII 16 and XVI 20," *VT* 4 (1954) 183.

22. → חָטָא *ḥāṭā' (chāṭā')* (IV, 309-19).

23. W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel 2. Herm* (Eng. trans. 1983), 434.

24. Elliger, *Leviticus,* 51.

vent the continued adherence to other understandings of the law as well, such as that in Nu. 18:17, which stipulates that Aaron is not to redeem the firstborn of cows, sheep, or goats, or the notion that private burnt offerings can also include small livestock such as a sheep or goat, albeit male and without blemish (Lev. 1:10).

Upon completion of the "tabernacle," offerings are accepted from a representative of each of the Israelite tribes, including a male goat as a sin offering (Nu. 7:16-82), yielding altogether twelve male goats (7:87). For the period when Israel inhabits the land, precise sacrificial regulations are given regarding oxen, rams, lambs of sheep, and kids of goats (15:11); unintentional sins of the congregation require a male goat as a sin offering (15:24) or a yearling female goat (15:27; cf. Lev. 4:28). From a comparison between Nu. 15 and Lev. 4, K. Elliger concludes "that the male goat was originally the sin offering of the *congregation*."[25] Male goats function similarly as sin offerings (Lev. 9:3) at the monthly sacrifice (Nu. 28:15), Festival of Weeks (Nu. 28:30; Lev. 23:19), at the first, tenth, and fifteenth days of the seventh month as well as at the seven-day festival beginning then (Nu. 29:5,11,16,19,25; cf. also vv. 22,28,31,34,38) and at the great Day of Atonement (Lev. 16:5). Whereas the sin of a prince is atoned through a male goat without blemish (Lev. 4:23), the unintentional sin of an ordinary person requires a female goat without blemish (Lev. 4:28; cf. Nu. 15:27) as in the case of a sin offering (Lev. 5:6). A goat can also be used for the offering of well-being (or peace offering, Lev. 3:12). Finally, Lev. 22 also stipulates that oxen, sheep, and goats offered as sacrifices must be without blemish and male (v. 19) and that the young animals may be sacrificed only after they are eight days old (v. 27).

One stipulation worth noting is that found in Lev. 3:13; 4:24,29, and applying after 3:12 in a general sense to sacrifices: those offering the sacrifice are to lay their hands[26] on the head of the goat and then slaughter it before Yahweh. By contrast the later text 5:5f. says that the sinners must confess their guilt and bring "your penalty" before Yahweh. Of the two male goats on the great Day of Atonement, lots determine which is presented as a sin offering and which is sent into the wilderness for Azazel (16:5-10).

3. *Gen. 15:9.* Gen. 15:7-21 presents a unique problem. This narrative has doubtless undergone a complicated growth process. The basic stratum narrates the events as such quite clearly: At God's behest, Abraham, who has doubted Yahweh's promise, brings a heifer, female goat, and ram, all three years old; he cuts each of these in two and lays the halves over against one another. He then also brings a turtledove and a young pigeon, and drives away birds of prey. That night, when Abraham is in a deep sleep, Yahweh passes through the animals in the form of a smoking firepot and a flaming torch. In conclusion, this is interpreted as the "making of a covenant" confirming Yahweh's promise of land to Abraham (vv. 7f.; differently in v. 18b).

The first question, whether the dividing of the animals represents a sacrificial act, can be answered fairly unequivocally. Since no altar is mentioned, such does not seem

25. Ibid., 58.
26. → סמך *sāmak̲*.

to be required for this particular series of events, and this militates against a sacrificial situation, though C. Westermann suggests that through the mention of sacrificial animals this scene was actually subsequently accommodated to a sacrificial act.[27] The threefold designation "three years old" allegedly also corresponds to sacrificial praxis. As far as the animals themselves are concerned, even though "ram" and "pigeon/dove" are indeed used in sacrificial rituals, only 1 S. 16:2 mentions *ʿeg̱lâ* as a sacrificial animal,[28] and *gôzāl* is not mentioned anywhere in this connection. This makes it questionable that Gen. 15 was reinterpreted as a sacrificial act or that the subsequent addition of the two birds intended to round out the totality of animals that might be sacrificed.[29] A look at the *m^e^šullāš* also confirms this. A. Dillmann already notes in this regard: "used in this sense only here and 1 S. 1:24 LXX."[30] Nor is this word found in connection with OT sacrificial rituals. The resonance with Jer. 34:18f. and the extrabiblical analogies instead suggest that this ceremony was from the outset intended as a rite sealing the contract itself. But because here it is Yahweh alone who through this gesture is confirming the inviolability of his promise to Abraham, the reference is definitely not to a contract. The expression "oath rite," however, also seems inappropriate,[31] since neither this nor comparable texts indicate the presence of an oath.

IV. Qumran. Among the Qumran writings, occurrences of *ʿēz* are concentrated almost exclusively in the Temple Scroll. "Goats" are included in the sacrifices at New Year's (11QT 15:2), the Feast of Unleavened Bread (17:14; 18:4), Feast of Oil (23:4), Feast of the Wood (23:11), Atonement (25:14), and Tabernacles (28:4,8,11). The difficult text of 4Q502 8:2 is speaking perhaps about the paschal lamb. The Temple Scroll's more stringent regulations over against parallel regulations in Deuteronomy are worth noting. For example, 11QT 52:5 goes beyond Dt. 17:1 in prohibiting the sacrifice of pregnant animals, equating them thus with blemished animals. It also makes more precise the regulations concerning secular slaughter (Dt. 12, esp. v. 21): "You shall not slaughter clean cattle or sheep or goat in any of your towns, within a distance of three days' journey from my sanctuary [in Jerusalem]" (11QT 52:13). No meat may be eaten near the sanctuary unless the slaughter is carried out in the temple itself (52:19f.).

Only once is *ʿēz* used with the meaning "goat's hair"; weaves made of this material can, like clothes and skins, be purified after defilement (through contact with stillbirth) through washing (11QT 50:17).

Zobel

---

27. C. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36* (Eng. trans., Minneapolis, 1985), in loc. Cf. W. Zimmerli, *1. Mose 12-25: Abraham. ZBK* I/2 (1976), 53.

28. On Dt. 21:1-9, cf. von Rad, *Deuteronomy,* in loc., who wonders whether this involves a sacrifice in the first place.

29. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* in loc.

30. A. Dillmann, *Die Genesis. KEHAT* XI (^{6}1892), 249; see also Eng. trans. *Genesis, Critically and Exegetically Expounded,* trans. W. B. Stevenson (Edinburgh, 1897), in loc.

31. Westermann, *Genesis 12–36,* in loc.

עָזַב *'āzaḇ;* עִזְבוֹנִים *'izzᵉḇônîm*

Contents: I. The Root: 1. Semitic Languages; 2. Homonymous Roots? 3. Derivatives; 4. Translations. II. Meanings: 1. Forms and Distribution; 2. With Inanimate Objects; 3. With Persons as Objects; 4. With Abstractions as Objects; 5. Passive Forms; 6. Problem Passages; 7. Word Field. III. Specialized Use: 1. Law; 2. Prayer; 3. Historical Theology; 4. Wisdom. IV. Subsequent Influence.

I. The Root.

1. *Semitic Languages.* The root *'zb* is found in Akkadian, East Canaanite, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Ugaritic. A similar semantic scope as *'zb* is exhibited by the widespread Akk. *ezēbu* along with its derivatives (*ezbu/uzību,* "abandoned child"; *izbu,* "malformed newborn, monstrosity"; *ezib,* "apart from, except"; *izibtum,* "pledge, warranty"; *uzubbû,* "divorce"; *mušēzibu,* "savior"; *šūzubu,* "saved") and stems (esp. G: "abandon"; Š: "save"; N: passive to the G stem).[1] The East Canaanite term *ḥzb,* "save," follows the *Š* stem semantically.[2] Arabic attests the verb meaning "to be far" and the adjective meaning "single, only."[3] The root of Eth. *ma'sab* is related.[4] As regards consonantal makeup, Ugar. *'db,* "lay, make," is possibly related,[5] though the verb coincides with Heb. *'āśâ, 'āraḵ, šîṯ,* etc., and by no means with *'zb.* The OSA term *'ḏb,* "make, do," belongs to the same semantic category.[6]

2. *Homonymous Roots?* The question of possible homonymous roots, an important one for lexicography, semantics, and exegesis, is strongly disputed.[7] From Neh. 3:8 scholars derive *'zb* II, "pave, construct," allegedly covered by Middle Heb. *ma'ᵃzîḇâ,*

'āzaḇ. L. Alonso Schökel, *Materiales para un diccionario biblico hebreo-español* (Rome, 1985); J. Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the OT* (Oxford, 1968); M. Dahood, "The Root עזב II in Job," *JBL* 78 (1959) 303-9; E. S. Gerstenberger and W. Schrage, *Suffering* (Eng. trans., Nashville, 1980); H. B. Huffmon, "Exodus 23,4-5: A Comparative Study," *A Light unto My Path. FS J. M. Myers* (Philadelphia, 1974), 271-78; O. Loretz, "Ugaritische und hebräische Lexikographie (II)," *UF* 13 (1981) 127-35, esp. 131-34; H. Seidel, *Das Erlebnis der Einsamkeit im AT. ThArb* 29 (1969); H.-P. Stähli, "עזב *'zb* 'abandon,'" *TLOT,* II, 866-68; I. N. Vinnikov, "L'énigme de *'āṣūr* et *'āzūb,*" *Hommages à A. Dupont-Sommer* (Paris, 1971), 343-45; T. Willi, "Die Freiheit Israels," *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. FS W. Zimmerli* (Göttingen, 1977), 531-46; H. G. M. Williamson, "A Reconsideration of עזב II in Biblical Hebrew," *ZAW* 97 (1985) 74-85.

1. Cf. *AHw,* I, 267-69; *CAD,* IV, 416-26.
2. *APNM,* 192.
3. Wehr, 610a; Lane, V, 2033f.
4. *LexLingAeth,* 973f.
5. *WUS,* no. 2002; *UT,* no. 1818; Dahood.
6. E. Ullendorff, "Ugaritic Marginalia, II," *JSS* 7 (1962) 344. Cf. Biella, 353: "repair."
7. See Williamson.

"composition/plastered floor." Equally questionable is whether Ugar. *'db,* "to lay, prepare, make," might provide the basis.[8] Because none of the cognate languages attests homonymous roots,[9] and because the linguistic similarity between *d* and *z* in this case is doubtful, one ought not assume the presence of two different roots in Hebrew. Disputed occurrences can be explained on the basis of *'zb* I (Ex. 23:5b; 1 Ch. 16:37; Job 9:27; 10:1; 18:4; 20:13; 30:14). In Neh. 3:8 one might either translate "left standing" or assume the presence of a special local use of *'zb;* cf. Neh. 3:34(Eng. 4:2): "leave be."

3. *Derivatives.* The number of derivatives is remarkably small (cf. the Akkadian). The term *'izzeḇônîm,* "goods, wares," derives from the intensified stem,[10] though possibly with passive meaning. The term *'ᵃzûḇâ* occurs as a personal name and represents a qal passive participle.[11]

4. *Translations.* The Biblical Aramaic equivalent is *šbq* (Ezr. 6:7; Dnl. 2:44; 4:12,20,23[15,23,26]) with the meaning "leave, leave be/behind." The stem of *šêziḇ,* "save," is related (Dnl. 3:15-28; 6:15-28[14-27]; cf. Akk. *šūzubu*). The Greek translations use nineteen different expressions for *'zb* qal alone, the main ones being *enkataleípein,* "abandon, leave, betray" (about 140 times) and *kataleípein,* "abandon, leave, go away" (47 times). The NT uses these words only 10 and 25 times, respectively; by contrast, *aphiénai* appears 126 times with the semantic nuances "release, issue, leave, leave be." The LXX uses *aphiénai* 6 times to render *'zb.*[12]

II. Meanings.

1. *Forms and Distribution.* The root occurs in the Hebrew canon largely in its verbal forms and is quite widespread, not occurring only in Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Micah, Nahum, Habbakuk, Haggai, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and Esther, probably because of the small size of these texts. Specific usage is suggested by concentrations of this word in the Deuteronomistic history and the Chronicler's history as well as in the Psalms.

Statistically the following distribution emerges: According to Lisowski, the qal forms, including *'zb* II, occur 204 times, the niphal 9 times, and the pual twice. The secondary noun *'izzeḇônîm* occurs 7 times, all in Ezk. 27; the fem. PN *'ᵃzûḇâ,* "desolation, abandoned one," occurs 4 times (1 K. 22:42 par. 2 Ch. 20:31; 1 Ch. 2:18,19).

According to A. Eben-Shoshan, the qal appears 32 times in narrative time *(impf. consecutive),* 74 times as perfect, 55 as imperfect, 13 as active and 12 as passive participle, and 5 as imperative. The remaining 13 occurrences are infinitives, the infinitive absolute occurring only in Ex. 23:5 and Jer. 14:5.

---

8. Both *HAL,* II, 807; and B. Margalit, "Lexicographical Notes on the Aqht Epic (Part II: KTU 1.19)," *UF* 16 (1984) 157f., affirm this; both Williamson, 77; and O. Loretz, "Ugaritische und hebräische Lexikographie (II)," *UF* 13 (1981) 131-34, deny this.

9. A different view is taken by Margalit, *UF* 16 (1984) 157f.

10. *GK,* §84b.

11. *IPN,* 231.

12. Cf. R. Bultmann, *TDNT,* I, 509-12.

2. *With Inanimate Objects.* The basic meaning is "leave." A person or a being conceived with personal characteristics removes itself from an object, dissolving thereby its connections with that object. In English, too, "leave" is often enough used transitively, suggesting that leaving something behind or abandoning it involves less the physical movement away than the establishment of a completely new condition. Things formerly connected are separated. The person or entity doing the leaving sets itself free of the thing left. This is the crucial feature T. Willi discusses with regard to the use of *ʿzb* in legal texts to mean emancipation. Someone can leave something over ("left over" in this sense in Mal. 3:19[4:1]; cf. Dnl. 4:12,20,23[15,23,26]). Harvest surplus is to be left for the poor and aliens (Lev. 19:10; 23:22; cf. Ruth 2:16), effectively a renunciation of property claims. Potiphar leaves "everything" in the charge of his new vizier (Gen. 39:6; cf. 1 Ch. 16:37), effectively a transfer of authority. In his own turn, Joseph must leave behind his garment (Gen. 39:12,15,18), effectively a ceding of evidence. The same coercive nature attaches to having to surrender or give up something, as when inhabitants surrender their city (1 S. 31:7 par. 1 Ch. 10:7) or land (2 K. 8:6; Ruth 2:11; cf. Ezk. 8:12; 9:9), when people give up their property (Job 39:11; Ps. 49:11[10]; Jer. 7:11), and when an inferior force abandons its property (2 K. 7:7; 2 Ch. 28:14; cf. 2 Ch. 11:14) or even its idols (2 S. 5:21 par. 1 Ch. 14:12). These incidents are narrated in the imperfect consecutive. Animal relationships show that even animals can experience this sort of separation (Job 39:14; Jer. 14:5; 25:38). Although *ʿzb* is rarely used intransitively (cf. Gen. 44:22; Ruth 2:16; Prov. 28:13; Jer. 14:5), these passages do exhibit an extremely strong emphasis on the action itself, quite independent of any object, the reference to which is contextually given.

3. *With Persons as Objects.* With regard to persons, this sort of turning away or separation also generates juridical, economic, political, and emotional considerations. The solidarity of the small group obligates a person to "being there" with others, and to mutual help. "Abandoning" a clan member, in extreme cases even an alien or an enemy (Ex. 23:5; Lev. 19:10), violates the elementary bonds of community and calls life itself into question. A sick slave is left behind to starve to death (1 S. 30:13; cf. 2 Ch. 24:25). David leaves behind ten concubines to an uncertain fate (2 S. 15:16). Ruth leaves behind all security in following her mother-in-law (Ruth 2:11). "Bearing and forsaking," a metaphor for the most extreme distress (Jer. 14:5; cf. Isa. 49:15), shows that anyone torn from the security of the family is no longer capable of life itself. Abandonment (see 4 below) means certain death (though dying[13] is rarely equated with "leaving" or "being abandoned"; cf. Jer. 17:11; Ps. 88). This is why both wisdom and torah urge adherence to this obligation to solidarity (Ex. 23:5; Dt. 12:19; 14:27; Prov. 27:10; cf. Josh. 22:3). The godless enjoy wickedness and are unable to let it go (Job 20:13), while at the same time they abandon the poor and exploit them (Job 20:19; textually uncertain). Laments and petitions express the yearning for overcoming abandonment and for reestablishing fellowship (Nu. 10:31; Ps. 22:2[1]; 27:9f.; Isa. 49:14). Asseverations

---

13. → מוּת *mûṯ* (VII, 185-209).

not to leave someone, often formulated as oaths, seek to stabilize the status qùo (Josh. 24:16; Ruth 1:16; 2 K. 2:2,4,6; 4:30; Ps. 119:87; Isa. 41:17; cf. Gen. 32:27[26]: *šlḥ*). The numerous passages in which Yahweh and Israel are the subject or object of such "leaving" or "forsaking" all exhibit this kind of personal usage, something shown also by the adoption of terms from the sphere of the family: "children who deal corruptly, who have forsaken Yahweh" (Isa. 1:4; cf. Jer. 5:7). No more than a mother can forsake her child can Yahweh forsake his people (Isa. 49:14f.). Yahweh is Israel's husband (Isa. 54:5f.). This two-sided personal relationship between Yahweh and people is always presupposed: "Because you have forsaken Yahweh, he has also forsaken you" (2 Ch. 24:20; cf. Dt. 31:16f.; 1 Ch. 28:9). The social implications must be considered from a theological perspective as well.

4. *With Abstractions as Objects.* Beyond persons and inanimate things, abstract entities can also be left or forsaken, since such abstractions can represent relationships, values, or other features that can be actualized concretely or personally. Moreover, the boundaries between abstract and personal concepts in the OT are often quite fluid. The following abstractions appear: commandments, laws, justice (2 K. 17:16; Ps. 119:53, 87; Prov. 4:2,5f.; Isa. 58:2; Jer. 9:12; the proverb says of wisdom: "Do not forsake her, and she will keep you; love her, and she will guard you" [Prov. 4:6]); the fear of God (Job 6:14); Yahweh's loyalty and compassion (Gen. 24:27; Prov. 3:3; Jon. 2:9[8]); miraculous deeds (Isa. 42:16); counsel and guidance (1 K. 12:8,13 par. 2 Ch. 10:8,13; Prov. 2:13; Isa. 55:7); harlotry, evil (Job 20:13; Ezk. 23:8); strength, heart, spirit (Ps. 38:11[10]; 40:13[12]; Isa. 54:6[4]: *ᵃzûḇaṯ rûaḥ*). Peculiar examples include: "Where will you leave your *kāḇôḏ*?" (Isa. 10:3, meaning: "Where can you hide your wealth?");[14] "I will put off my (sad) countenance and be of good cheer" (Job 9:27). This considerably broadens the semantic palette of *'zb*. How can a person "leave" or "forsake" a norm, counsel, or solidarity with others? By disregarding them? Yahweh will not forsake his announced deeds (Isa. 42:16, meaning that he will not neglect doing them; this establishes a future reference). One's own power or will have now become the object: I perceive loss in myself.

5. *Passive Forms.* Examples of being abandoned are extremely widespread in the OT. Existence itself is called into question for those who lose the vital connections with their surroundings (see 3 above). To the extent that the root of *'zb* serves to describe this situation, it uses primarily passive participial forms from the qal, and the niphal and pual. Passives are negatively characterized; e.g., sacrifices are often thus described, as are women (Isa. 54:6) or cities conceived as feminine (Isa. 17:2,9; 32:14; 60:15; 62:4,12; Jer. 4:29; Ezk. 36:4; Zeph. 2:4; cf. Josh. 8:17), and the land (Lev. 26:43; Job 18:4; Isa. 6:12; 7:16). The abandonment of a woman results in widowhood, expulsion, or ruin.[15] The fem. qal

14. → VII, 25f.

15. On widowhood → אלמנה *'almānâ (almānāh)* (I, 287-91); on expulsion → שלח *šlḥ*; → נדח *ndḥ* (XI, 235-41); on ruin → בושׁ *bôš* (II, 50-60).

pass. ptcp. of *ʿzb* seems to have adopted these meanings to a far greater extent than has the masculine form (cf. the PN *ᵃzûbâ*). Still, the abandonment of a man also evokes the situation of the orphan, oppression, and death.[16] One wisdom axiom asserts that "I have not seen the righteous forsaken *(neᵉzāb)*" (Ps. 37:25). The book of Job, of course, provides the counterpart to this assertion even though the designation *ʿāzûb* does not occur (cf., e.g., Job 19:6-22). The language of individual laments ardently describes alienation and abandonment, though these laments[17] avoid the masc. pass. ptcp. of *ʿzb*. Finally, the enigmatic expression *ʿāṣûr wᵉʿāzûb* (occurring 5 times formulaically: Dt. 32:36; 1 K. 14:10; 21:21; 2 K. 9:8; 14:26) is not based on the notion of lament, referring instead with alliteration to the entirety of the population.[18] What remains unclear is whether "bound" and "free" refer to minors and those already come of age, to slaves and freepersons, or to the impure and the pure.[19]

The context of passive expressions also includes the term *ʿizzābôn,* "goods, stores," occurring in Ezk. 27. The basic meaning is presumably "what is left, what is delivered into commission."[20] Trade goods are otherwise normally described according to their value or according to the procedure of their production or exchange.[21]

6. *Problem Passages.* A few passages seem not to fit the schema of the subject that leaves and an object that is left. The syntax of these passages involves prepositional phrases. The occurrences in which a local/final element is added to the direct object are simple enough. An object is left "to/for someone" (Lev. 19:10; 23:22; Job 39:14; Ps. 16:10; 49:11[10]; such would also include Job 39:11: *ʿzb ʾel,* "will you hand over your labor to it?"). A similar situation obtains with regard to place references such as *bᵉyad, ʾeṣel, lipnê,* "with, before" (Gen. 39:6,12,13,15,18; 1 Ch. 16:37; 2 Ch. 12:5; Neh. 9:28; Ps. 37:33). The object remains at the designated place, whereas its owner departs.

One problem passage is Ex. 23:5 (cf. Dt. 22:4),[22] which seems top-heavy and contradictory. Does *ʿzb* have two different meanings here, "leave" and "lift up" (the sense of Dt. 22:4!)? The LXX seems to presuppose: *ʾal taʿazbēhû ûtᵉqîmēhû ʿimmô,* "do not leave him, but lift it [the ass] up with him [the enemy]." J. Halbe suspects that an original *ʿzb* II, "lift up," was forgotten, and because it was incomprehensible, was corrected as "cease from letting it lie."[23] Is this perhaps an absolute usage of *ʿzb*?[24] The prepositional objects *lô* and *ʿimmô* are referring to the owner of the ass. "Do not go away on his account [away from him?],[25] but leave [the ass] with him." Dt. 22:4 would then provide interpretive clarification.

---

16. Respectively, → יָתוֹם *yāṯôm* (VI, 477-81); → ענה *ʿnh* II; → מוּת *mûṯ* (VII, 185-209).
17. See III.3 below.
18. Cf. E. Kutsch, "Die Wurzel עצר im Hebräischen," *VT* 2 (1952) 57-69; Vinnikov.
19. → עצר *ʿāṣar.*
20. Willi, 541f.
21. → טוֹב *ṭôḇ* (V, 296-318); → ערב *ʿrb* I; a different view is take by Margalit, *UF* 16 (1984) 157f.
22. Cf. also Hittite law, §§45; 60-62; 71-73; *TUAT,* I, 104, 107-9.
23. J. Halbe, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes, Ex 34,10-26. FRLANT* 114 (1975), 430 n. 26.
24. Cf. II.2 above.
25. *HAL,* II, 508, no. 5.

The verb appears twice with *'al,* "over, on" (Ps. 10:14; Job 10:1). Commentaries incline to take Job 10:1 as a model case: "I leave my complaint on myself," i.e., "I bear my complaint." This "leaving, letting," turns into an inner, personal experience of conflict. Job 9:27 is similar: "I will put/leave off my (sad) countenance and be of good cheer."[26] Ps. 10:14 would then read, "The poor (?) leaves [his grief] on you." These obscure passages, too, confirm a basically transitive use of the verb.

7. *Word Field.* Word fields involving synonyms and antonyms in which the root *'zb* occurs can be divided into three large groups.

These involve (a) spatial-geographical contexts: "leave, go away," and "remain" (Nu. 10:31; cf. 1 K. 6:13; Jer. 9:1[2]; 48:28), "go" and "return" (Jer. 9:18[19]; 17:11; 25:38; cf. Ruth 1:16; Lam. 5:20), "flee and be steadfast" (Gen. 39:12,15; 1 S. 31:7; 2 K. 7:7; Isa. 10:3), "leave and die" (Ps. 16:10; Jer. 9:18[19]; 17:11), "abandon and retrieve" (Isa. 54:7), "turn aside and turn toward" (1 K. 9:6,9; 2 Ch. 7:19), "leave behind and take along" (Gen. 50:8; 1 S. 30:13; 2 S. 5:21; 2 Ch. 11:14; 24:25; Ps. 49:11[10]), "leave outside and bring inside" (Ex. 2:20; 9:21), "leave behind and take away" (Lev. 19:10; 23:22), "free and hold" (2 Ch. 28:14); (b) the social sphere: "leave and stay with someone" (Gen. 28:15; 2 K. 2:2ff.; 2 Ch. 12:5; Ps. 22:2[1]; 38:22), "forsake and stand by" (Dt. 31:6,8; Josh. 1:5), "abandon and take up" (1 K. 8:57; Ps. 27:9; 94:14; cf. Ps. 71:9), "forget and remember" (Job 39:14f.; Prov. 2:17; Isa. 49:14; 65:11), "leave and take up with someone new" (Gen. 2:24; cf. 1 K. 9:9; Prov. 27:10), "abandon and take care of" (Gen. 28:15; Dt. 12:19; Josh. 22:3; 2 Ch. 13:10; cf. Jer. 49:11; Neh. 10:40), "disregard ordinances and keep them" (Dt. 31:16f.; Prov. 10:17; 28:4), "become apostate and serve" (Josh. 24:16; Jgs. 2:12f.; 10:6ff.), "leave behind and follow after" (1 K. 19:20), "forsake and answer" (Isa. 41:17); (c) emotional elements: "despise and respect" (Job 6:14), "scorn and love" (Prov. 4:5f.), "become apostate and sin/become harlots" (Jgs. 10:10; Isa. 1:28; Jer. 5:7; Ezr. 8:22), "despise and respect" (Isa. 1:4), "leave evil in its place and be righteous" (Prov. 9:6; Ezk. 20:8; 23:8), "hand over, abandon and trust" (Job 39:11), "ignore and pay attention" (Prov. 4:2).

Although this word extends into a great many semantic fields, nowhere does it turn into a *terminus technicus,* remaining rather, even in its concentrated use, an arbitrary choice, i.e, what seems to be a somewhat diffuse verb of "movement away from." Several textual forms, however, do accentuate in certain, specific ways.

III. Specialized Use.

1. *Law.* In legal texts *'zb* refers to the end of a relationship of solidarity between members of a community or group, with various legal consequences attaching to such "leaving." Sons leave their parents to establish their own household (Gen. 2:24; *'zb — dbq* = cling to). Criminal issues can arise when parents abandon their children (cf. Ps. 27:10;[27]

---

26. A different view is taken by G. Fohrer, *Das Buch Hiob. KAT* XVI (1963), 199; following Dahood, 304f.: "make, do."

Isa. 49:14f.; Jer. 14:5; and CH §§170f., 191: inheritance and adoption law[28]). According to patriarchal law, a husband can dismiss his wife (Dt. 24:1; Jer. 3:1), though she may not leave him (Prov. 2:17; cf. Mal. 2:16: *šlḥ*).[29] In Akkadian, *ezēbu* is the legal term for the mutual dissolution of the marriage contract (cf. CH §§138, 141).[30] Since the divorced or widowed woman is also called *ᵃzûbâ* in the OT,[31] *'zb* may perhaps also be synonymous in Hebrew legal terminology to *šlḥ*. The transfer of property to an authorized person (administrator) is intended as a legal act in Gen. 39:6 (cf. CH §172: a mother transfers her marriage-gift to her children).[32] This is why "forsaking the torah/commandments" (e.g., 2 K. 17:16; Ezr. 9:10; Ps. 89:31[30]; Jer. 9:12[13], etc.) does not mean "disregard entrusted goods" (contra Willi). The diverse uses of *'zb* in the legal sphere show that the word refers in a neutral sense to leaving a relationship of solidarity; the context then determines the nature of each individual case.

2. *Prayer.* The language of prayer, especially in the Psalms, uses *'zb* in lament, petition, and expressions of trust. The personal God has forsaken the psalmist (Ps. 22:2[1]; 71:11; cf. Isa. 49:14; Lam. 5:20),[33] or is summoned (liturgically/in worship) in situations of extreme distress: "Do not cast me off, do not forsake me!" (Ps. 27:9; 38:22[21]; 71:9,18; 119:8). The confession of trust counters with the assertion that God will not forsake his believers (cf. Ps. 9:11[10]; 37:28,33; 94:14). All these passages use this verb in a fixed, sometimes formulaic fashion within a word field describing the destruction of personal bonds.[34] This means that the personal relationship of protection and solidarity between petitioners and their God is presupposed,[35] with the language of prayer here picking up on the legal language of family and clan. In the lament of the individual, God is the one who in some unexplained or even neglectful fashion has forsaken the suffering petitioner and abandoned the obligation to that relationship of solidarity.

3. *Historical Theology.* Most of the occurrences of *'zb* are found in exilic-postexilic theological reflections on history, texts that often use *'zb* almost as a leitmotif. This applies both to the Deuteronomistic history and the Chronicler's history as well as to traditions related to them.

Rather than individual petitioners and their personal, protective God, it is now the congregation or people who stand over against Yahweh, the God of Israel. The people have sinned and forsaken Yahweh (Dt. 28:20; 31:16; Jgs. 2:12f.; 10:6,13; 1 S. 8:8; 2 K.

---

27. Cf. *BWL,* 70, 11.
28. *TUAT,* I, 63f., 67.
29. → שׁלח *šālaḥ*.
30. *TUAT,* I, 59f.
31. See II.5 above.
32. *TUAT,* I, 64.
33. *KAR,* 148, 28; *BWL,* 253, 4.
34. → רחק *rḥq;* → נטשׁ *nṭš* (IX, 407-12); → שׁכח *škḥ*.
35. Cf. H. Vorländer, *Mein Gott. AOAT* 23 (1975); R. Albertz, *Persönliche Frömmigkeit und offizielle Religion. CThM* A 9 (1978), 38-43.

21:22; 22:17; Isa. 65:11; Jer. 2:13,17,19; 5:7,19; 16:11; 19:4; Hos. 4:10; beyond Kings, Chronicles also uses *'zb:* 2 Ch. 7:19,22; 12:1,5; 13:10f.; 15:2; 21:10; 24:18,20,24; 28:6; 29:6). Passages in which the law, the covenant, or the commandments are forsaken rather than Yahweh all follow this semantic model (even with analogous rhetorical forms and identical content), and are thus to be understood as a violation of loyalty toward another person (1 K. 18:18; 2 K. 17:16; Ezr. 9:10; Ps. 89:31[30]; Jer. 9:12[13]; 22:9; Dnl. 11:30). Typical expressions referring to Israel's apostasy from Yahweh, which prompted such harsh chastisement in the form of exile and dispersion, include: the congregation's confession of sin (Jgs. 10:10; 12:10; Ezr. 9:10); the argument for chastisement in the style of question-response (1 K. 9:8f.; Jer. 5:19; 9:11-15[12-16]; 16:10f.; 22:8f.; cf. additional stereotypical arguments in 1 K. 11:33; Jer. 19:4);[36] the formula of requital: "because Israel has forsaken Yahweh, Yahweh has forsaken Israel" (1 Ch. 28:9; 2 Ch. 12:5; 15:2; 24:20; 32:31; Neh. 9:17,19,28); sermon admonitions not to forsake Yahweh (lest the horrible punishment be repeated! Josh. 24:20; 1 Ch. 28:9; Jer. 19:4); promises to the community that Yahweh will not turn away from them again (1 K. 6:13; 1 Ch. 28:20; Isa. 41:17); self-obligation on the part of the people never (again) to become apostate (Josh. 24:16; 1 K. 8:57).

Together with the comprehensive vocabulary relating to apostasy (*prr, hlk, znh, sûr, 'bd, šḥh, bgd,* etc.),[37] *'zb* has in these exilic-postexilic texts a specific theological and ecclesial function. Increasingly it serves (Chronicles!) to ascribe culpability to the people as a means of generating a consciousness of their sin, doing so in a liturgical context. The usage here is strongly schematized, and we can no longer determine the sources from which the theologians of the time were drawing (the language of law? prayer?). They were probably preaching from the perspective of some form of covenantal theology (cf. Jer. 22:9; Dnl. 11:30)[38] only distantly related to the patriarchal religion and early Yahweh religion. The original sin was now the forsaking of Yahweh, betraying the confessional structure of Israelite society.

4. *Wisdom.* Amid the fixed discourse of the theologians of history, we find sentences in which *'zb* still means "leave" in a wholly unaffected and neutral fashion (cf. Neh. 10:40[39]; 1 Ch. 16:37; 2 Ch. 24:25; 28:14), though this word never became absorbed into theological jargon, not even in wisdom writings. These warn against leaving the proper path or the appropriate order (Prov. 2:13; 10:17; 15:10; cf. Job 20:13; 1 K. 12:8; Ezk. 20:8; 23:8), against leaving wisdom itself (Prov. 4:5f.), and demand that one turn away from foolishness and wickedness (Prov. 9:6; 28:13). The bipolar theological schema "avoid evil and do not forsake good" is thus pedagogically prefigured.

IV. Subsequent Influence. Extrabiblical and postcanonical Hebrew writings use *'zb* rarely, and then nontechnically. The Qumran writings contain 27 occurrences, 14 of

---

36. Cf. W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25. WMANT* 41 (1973), 295-300.

37. Cf. M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford, 1972), 339-41.

38. L. Perlitt, *Bundestheologie. WMANT* 36 (1969).

which are found in the hymns (with meanings similar to those in the Psalms, though cf. 1QH 8:27: *kᵉʾîš neʿᵉzāb*, "like one forsaken"). Rabbinic literature follows Ex. 23:5 in maintaining the meaning "alleviate, help," as well as the traditional meaning "leave, forsake," in all its variations.[39] The word plays a more significant role in the NT (cf. Mk. 10:28; Mt. 8:22; 16:24; 19:21,27; Lk. 5:28; 18:28).[40] "Look, we have left everything and followed you" (Mk. 10:28) is an early Christian confession that ascetic movements have cited repeatedly over the course of church history.

Gerstenberger

39. Jastrow, II, 1060f.
40. Albeit one that *TDNT* virtually ignores.